The Office of this JOURNAL *and of the* WEEKLY REPORTER *is now at* 12, *Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.*

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *is—Town, 26s.; Country 28s.; with the* WEEKLY REPORTER, *52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 5s.*

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JULY 26, 1873.

IN THE PROVINCIAL COURTS of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York the proctors are still to retain their old monopoly of practice. Such is the decision of Sir R. Phillimore in the recent case of *Burch* v. *Reid*, an ecclesiastical suit in which the defendant desired to appear by a solicitor. A full report of this case will be given in our next issue. No doubt the matter was one for the discretion of the learned judge, and without his permission any solicitor practising as a proctor would have been liable to penalties. And it may be, that until the Legislature interferes as it has already done in the case of the Probate, the Divorce and the Admiralty Courts, the learned judge was right in upholding the vested interests of the old practitioners. At the same time there appears no more reason why solicitors should be debarred from practising than barristers, who have long ago established themselves side by side with civilians in the Arches Courts, without the aid of any Act of Parliament. In the case recently decided the analogy afforded by the admission of barristers was pressed upon the Court, but in vain. The Dean of Arches thought that the case of solicitors was distinguishable from that of barristers, because no penalty was imposed upon the latter. We fail to appreciate this line of reasoning. Solicitors, unless duly authorised, might be liable to penalties. But if authorised they would, it seems to us, be free from liability just as much as they are free although they now exercise, under statute, proctorial functions in the Courts of Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty. The question in *Burch* v. *Reid* really was, whether the Court had power to make a rule for the admission of persons other than proctors. With great respect to Sir R. Phillimore it certainly appears to us that such a power is inherent in the Court, which is a "Superior Court." Whether it is one which is proper to be exercised is another matter. The vested interests of the proctors are almost infinitesimal in the Arches Court; but such as they are it may be right to preserve them. We do not dissent, therefore, so much from the conclusion of Sir R. Phillimore as from the reasons given for it.

WE HAVE LATELY RECEIVED from America some numbers of the *Albany Law Journal*, containing an interesting set of letters written by different European statesmen and professors of international law in answer to some proposals for joint action between the jurists and statesmen of different countries for the improvement of international law. Of these proposals one emanated from the Rev. J. B. Miles, of Boston, U.S., the other from M. Rolin Jacquemyns, of Ghent, the editor of the *Revue de Droit International*. Mr. Miles appears, judging from the answers sent to him, to have proposed to convene a "senate or institute of publicists and jurists of different nations with a view to the elaboration of an international code," and also a general congress of the same popular character as the congresses of the Social Science Association or the International Prison Congress held last year in London. M. Rolin Jacquemyns's proposal is for a conference of a limited number of jurists, who are (1) to agree upon, and jointly declare, certain fundamental propositions as to international law; and (2) to organise a permanent institute or organ of scientific opinion on international law. As to the practicability of forming an international code, the opinions expressed in the published answers are very conflicting. Almost all the foreign jurists and statesmen are in favour of attempting such a codification, *e.g.*, Professors Mancini, Holzendorff, Heffter, Pierrantoni, M. Calvo, Count Sclopis, Viscount d'Itajuba, and M. Drouyn de Lhuys. On the other hand, all the English jurists, viz., Mr. Vernon Harcourt, Professor Bernard, Mr. Westlake and Professor E. C. Clark agree that such a code is impracticable or undesirable; and M. Rolin Jacquemyns appears to be almost of the same opinion. Mr. Vernon Harcourt "sees no means of getting together any corporate authority, which would have the right or the power of undertaking such a task." Mr. Westlake "believes that the attempt to make a complete code would fail through the extent of disagreement which it would reveal," and very pertinently refers to the differences of opinion as to the binding character of international contracts as disclosed by the discussions in 1870-1 as to the Black Sea Clauses of the Treaty of Paris, and their denunciation by Russia. Professor Bernard doubts whether any government in the world "would run the risk" of adopting the proposed international code, as that "would be to convert the whole mass of rules and definitions contained in the code into matter of express treaty obligation, so that no government could recede from any of them (though afterwards found defective in substance or expression) without a breach of faith."

There is a much more general agreement between the different writers in favour of M. Rolin Jacquemyns's proposed institute or organ of scientific opinion on questions of international law, though some of the letters contain just warnings against claiming too much moral authority for such an organ, until it had, by prudent action on subjects of minor importance, acquired the confidence of the public. The proposals of Mr. Miles and M. Rolin Jacquemyns have much in common with the resolution which Mr. Richard proposed to the House of Commons on the 8th inst. in favour of communicating with foreign governments with a view to the improvement of international law and the establishment of a permanent tribunal for international arbitration. But it is noteworthy that the jurists and statesmen, whose answers we have before us, are almost unanimously of opinion that whatever may be done in this direction should be altogether unofficial and independent of Government interference.

IT IS ALWAYS AMUSING to mark when a doctrine which has seemed for a time to threaten to run away with the Court receives a check that brings it again within the domain of common sense. The question of the liability of a director of a joint stock company, in respect of the number of shares which are named by the articles as constituting a director's qualification, is just now passing through this phase. It had been so broadly and so uncompromisingly laid down, as a sort of maxim of public policy that it was necessary that a director should have a substantial interest in the company, that we were rapidly becoming in danger of finding that, let the articles of a company contain but a whisper of shares in connection with the word director, every director was to be held liable for shares which the Court would assume that he had agreed to take. In *Lord Claud Hamilton's case* (21 W. R. 518, L. R. 8 Ch. 548), the exuberance of this fancy was corrected. The Lords Justices there went so far as to construe the "future qualification of a director" as meaning "the qualification of a future director," and thereby to relieve the particular directors in question from liability. We ventured at the time of the decision (*ante* p. 379) to suggest a doubt whether this

construction of the words was wholly satisfactory, but the case is, by the very existence of such a doubt, rendered the more forcible upon the general question. In the last week the Lord Chancellor, in *Re Anglo-Moravian Hungarian Junction Railway Company, Forbes' case*, has held a director not liable for the number of shares fixed as the director's qualification. The case came on appeal from James, L.J., sitting for Wickens, V.C., at chambers; and the decision of the Lord Chancellor reverses that of the Lord Justice. Under such circumstances we cannot but echo the regret expressed by the Lord Chancellor that, owing to the case having been heard in chambers, there is no means of ascertaining the grounds of the Lord Justice's decision. So far as our present purpose is concerned, the facts were simply these: Mr. Forbes was nominated as a director by the articles of association. The provision in the articles as to the qualification of the directors was—"Every member of the company holding not less than fifty shares shall be eligible as a director." Upon this it was sought to fix Mr. Forbes with fifty shares. But, as the Lord Chancellor pointed out, the word "eligible" is applicable only to the election of future directors. The case is on all fours with *Ex parte Stock* (12 W. R. 814, 994, 4 D. J. & S. 426), and is wholly free from any such observation as *Lord Claud Hamilton's case* was open to in respect of the meaning of the word there used, viz., "qualification." It would appear that, in the midst of the many strange decisions to which joint stock company law seems, for some reason or other, to be so peculiarly exposed, there is a danger of losing sight of the very plain and simple principles on which these questions turn. The liability of a director for a director's qualification rests entirely on the evidence which his position affords of an agreement on his part to accept the prescribed number of shares. There is no magical power which fixes a director with shares. If to his office is annexed the condition of holding shares, the acceptance of the office is the acceptance of the shares, but that is all. It is manifestly absurd to say that a provision that the holding of fifty shares shall render a person eligible for an office is any evidence whatever of an agreement to take that number of shares on the part of a person who is the holder of the office, independently of election.

Previously to the Partition Act, 1868 (31 & 32 Vict. c. 40) where land was held in co-ownership, a majority, however large, of the co-owners could not insist upon a sale (*Turner* v. *Morgan*, 8 Ves 143; *Parker* v. *Gerard*, Amb. 236; *Warner* v. *Baynes*, Amb. 589). The Act alters this rule, and provides by section 4 that where the parties representing at least a moiety of the estate desire a sale, the Court *shall* direct a sale, unless it sees good reason to the contrary. On the other hand, by section 3, where persons representing less than a moiety desire a sale, the Court *may* order a sale, if under all the circumstances it appears more beneficial for the parties interested than a partition. As generally happens when a new rule is introduced by statute, the judges were at first reluctant to forego the old practice; and in *Dicks* v. *Batten* (not reported) Vice-Chancellor Stuart held that a sale ought not to be granted at the instance of a party entitled to five-eighths in a case where a partition could be made without difficulty—a decision which Vice-Chancellor Malins followed in *Pemberton* v. *Barnes* (19 W. R. 709, L. R. 6 Ch. 687 n). The latter decision was, however, overruled by Lord Hatherley (see 19 W. R. 988, L. R. 6 Ch. 685), and it may now be considered as settled that if the owners of a moiety or more desire a sale, the owners of the remainder must, even where the estate is large and a partition would be easy, show some special grounds to induce the Court to refuse a sale. The presumption is in favour of sale. In *Allen* v. *Allen*, decided by Vice-Chancellor Wickens last week, an attempt seems to have been made to force a sale on the owners of four-sixths, mainly on the ground that the Chief Clerk had certified that a sale would be more beneficial for all parties than a partition. The majority desired a partition of the bulk of the property, and evidence was adduced to show (1) that though part of the property consisted of houses a partition could be made without difficulty, and (2) that the property was increasing in value. The Vice-Chancellor thought that the balance of argument might rather be in favour of a sale, but he held, in accordance, as it seems to us, with the clear intention of section 3 of the Act, that this circumstance was not sufficient to justify him in forcing a sale of the entire property upon a dissentient majority, and he therefore made an order referring it to chambers to make a partition of so much of the property as was capable of apportionment, and a sale of so much as was incapable of apportionment. There must be many cases in which justice will be best done by an order of this kind, which gives due effect to the wishes of the majority, but does not permit them to be carried to the unreasonable extent tolerated by the old rule.

A case has just occurred at the Nottingham Assizes which is only one among many instances of the difficulties attendant upon the present system of circuits. Four days having been allowed for the assizes, a very heavy case was entered for trial, involving the question whether a certain footpath passing through the Newstead Abbey Estate was a public highway or not. As is usual in such cases, a very large number of witnesses were to be called on both sides; and the case, it was stated, would have taken two or even three days to try. It was suggested that, if the jury viewed the *locus in quo*, a great deal of time would be ultimately saved, but it was found that, if a view were had, there would probably not be time to finish the trial. Under these circumstances the case was postponed, the question when it should come on again being left open. The judge said he was willing to try it after Leeds Assizes or in October, but this would no doubt depend upon the consent of all parties, which may not be procurable. The result is certainly a great hardship so far as the proprietor of Newstead Abbey is concerned, for, if he be right in his contention, he will practically be obliged to put up with the constant trespasses of the colliers of the surrounding districts over his private property for the remainder of the summer, and most probably for considerably longer. If the defendants are right, there is not, practically speaking, much hardship so far as they are concerned, inasmuch as they are no doubt only interested as representing the public, and probably are not themselves finding the sinews of war, while in the meantime the public will substantially enjoy the right for which they contend. All exceptionally heavy cases must, to some extent, produce difficulties of this sort, even without a system of circuits. The question is how far the evil can be abated, and to what extent the system of circuits tends to aggravate it. One great difficulty arises from the absence of any certain data with regard to which the length of time allotted to each place may be fixed. Causes are allowed to be entered up to the very last moment; and though the amount of the Crown business may be known almost exactly, it is impossible to tell, when the time is fixed, what the amount of civil business may be. On most circuits the time allotted seems to be governed by a sort of average computation. With respect to large places, this may perhaps be the most reasonable plan. Where the number of cases is large, it may be that, taking one with another, a rough approximation to an average period within which the whole may fairly be expected to be disposed of may be arrived at; but it is obvious that the smaller the place, and the smaller the amount of business usually to be disposed of, the greater the difficulty occasioned by the sudden appearance of a *cause celebre*. Even if it were known beforehand that such a case would be entered, difficulties would arise, inasmuch as the case may of course be withdrawn at the last moment, and then the result is that many more

days may be fixed for the place than are absolutely necessary, the business at the next place is delayed, and the time of the judges and the bar wasted. It is not very obvious what the cure for this state of things is. Of course it would be to a very great extent remedied by the establishment of local courts of first instance. But it appears to us that the question whether it is desirable to abolish our circuit system and establish local courts is one of a very wide character, and not to be determined with reference to an occasional case of exceptional hardship. Would-be law reformers and newspaper writers are far too fond, like empirical professors of the healing art, of propounding any nostrum likely to be corrective of some particular symptom of the moment, which has attracted their immediate attention. But, short of a complete abolition of the system of circuits, it seems to us worthy of serious consideration whether something might not be done by way of consolidation of some of the smaller places on many of our circuits. This would tend to mitigate the evils above referred to. There are, no doubt, difficulties in the way of such a plan. Questions would arise with regard to the convenience of the place selected for jurymen, witnesses, &c., and local jealousies would be aroused. It is impossible for anyone, not well acquainted with the bearings of the question all over the country, to speak with authority as to how far any such remedy as that suggested would be generally applicable; but if such a remedy could be applied without creating greater evils, there is no doubt that it would tend in many respects to remedy some of the principal difficulties now attendant upon the circuit system.

BY THE LAMENTED death of Mr. Jacob Waley and the retirement of Mr. Charles Hall, two vacancies have recently been made among the six conveyancing counsel to the Court of Chancery. We understand that these vacancies have been filled up by the appointment of Mr. Arthur Burrows and Mr. Henry Casson. To the selection of Mr. Burrows for this dignified position no one can object, and we venture to congratulate him on his well-merited promotion. As to the other appointment, without wishing to imply anything depreciatory of Mr. Casson, we cannot refrain from saying that most members of the profession will feel some regret that this blue ribbon of the conveyancers has not been awarded to one or other of the more distinguished followers of their branch of practice. Mr. Burrows was called to the bar in 1836, and Mr. Casson twenty years later. We are informed that Mr. Casson is a son-in-law of Mr. Charles Hall.

IT IS WITH GREAT PLEASURE that we draw attention to a movement which has just been set on foot by a large number of solicitors for the purpose of presenting a testimonial to Mr. T. W. Braithwaite, of the Record and Writ Clerks' Office. The labours and merits of this gentleman are too well known to our readers to render it necessary for us to show in what respects and to what extent he has deserved well of our profession. It will be sufficient to say that the books of practice which he has written, or aided in writing, have been found of the very greatest assistance to all persons engaged in matters transacted in the Court of Chancery; and that, during a service of upwards of thirty years, he has always shown himself personally most ready to afford practitioners the benefit of the accurate and extensive knowledge which he possesses of his own particular department. We shared in the regret felt by most of those who were acquainted with the facts, that Mr. Braithwaite was not appointed one of the Clerks of Records and Writs on the occasion of the last vacancy. The intended testimonial will, let us hope, be as gratifying to him as any promotion would have been. We may add that we notice with pleasure that the promoters of the testimonial have not given an ungracious aspect to the movement by bringing forward in connection with it any dissatisfaction they may feel at Mr. Braithwaite's claims having been recently disregarded in high quarters. We cordially wish all success to the testimonial, which coming from men accustomed to hard work as a token of esteem for a hard, successful, and upright worker, will be honourable both to the givers and to the recipient.

IN OUR LAST ISSUE we implied an intention of continuing our consideration of the Judicature Bill as altered by the House of Commons, with a view principally to the then probable action of the House of Lords. Since that time, however, their Lordships, by agreeing, with one exception, to all the important amendments, have rendered further speculation in that respect superfluous; and under these circumstances we consider it better to defer any more extended remarks upon the measure until after it has passed into law.

THE NATIONAL DEBT OFFICE AND THE CHANCERY SUITORS' FUNDS.

The second report of the Committee of Public Accounts, recently issued, contains some remarkable and important disclosures on the subject of the irregularities connected with the postal and telegraph services, and on the facilities for a complete neglect of duty which the system under review gave to the National Debt Office and the Exchequer and Audit Department. In the following remarks we must be understood to speak of the system of dealing with public moneys lately examined into, and not of the individual public servants who had the charge of carrying out that system.

The object we have in view is to call attention to the fact that large funds, which are as much private property as the money of savings' bank depositors, have recently been brought within the influence of this system, or want of system as it should be more properly described; and to show to all whom it may concern the importance of extreme vigilance in the highest public officials over all the acts of their subordinates.

By the Court of Chancery (Funds) Act, 1872 (35 & 36 Vict. c. 44), which came into operation on the 7th of January, 1873, after reciting that it was expedient to abolish the office of the Accountant-General of the Court of Chancery, and to make provision respecting the transaction of the business of his office, and the securing on the Consolidated Fund and managing the moneys, effects, and securities of the suitors of the Court, the Paymaster-General is invested with all the powers and authorities exercised by the Accountant-General. The Act then provides for the payment or transfer to the credit or account of the Paymaster-General of all the funds and securities belonging to the suitors in the Court of Chancery, and orders (section 14) that any money standing to the credit of that officer, and not required by him for the purpose of meeting current demands, is to be placed in the hands of the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, who are to provide the Paymaster-General with money to meet his current demands. The National Debt Office is further directed (section 17), subject to the orders of the Treasury, to invest all money entrusted to it in Government securities, and the Treasury (section 20) must cause separate accounts to be kept of the transactions of the Paymaster-General and of the National Debt Office, and also accounts of the liabilities of the Consolidated Fund.

Now, it should be understood that the balances of cash, the property of the suitors of the Court of Chancery, consist of the various sums of cash standing to the credit of some thirty thousand causes, &c., and although few of them are individually of large amount, the aggregate value is anything but small. The effect, then, of this Act is to hand over to the Chancellor of the Exchequer large sums of unused cash, being the sum total of the floating balances on the several accounts before referred to, with liberty for him to invest them according to his own will, and to make a profit of the money, not only by appropriating it to public purposes as occasion may

require, but also by the surplus interest derived from its investment.

Now, if we study the statistics of these balances, we find that they vary but little from year to year, except in the direction of increase; and therefore that nearly the whole of the funds handed over to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or to his representatives, the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, are available for the purposes, whatever they may be, to which they may be applied by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the current receipts being more than sufficient to meet the current payments out to suitors.

On referring to the judicial statistics most recently published, which, however, only date up to November, 1871, we find that about £60,000,000 of stocks and above £3,000,000 of cash must in January, 1873, have been handed over to the National Debt Office in accordance with the before-mentioned Act and the Chancery Funds Rules and Orders, 1873, and for the whole of those amounts as well as for all future amounts the property of the suitors of the Court of Chancery the Consolidated Fund is liable.

Now there really appears to be nothing very alarming in this statement, and we should have scarcely thought the time or space taken in noticing these facts well spent had not the report before alluded to given a warning which ought not to be neglected.

Among the various remarks contained in this report, we find the committee state, with respect to the dealing with the Post Office funds, that nothing has been laid before them which can modify their opinion expressed in their report of March last, viz., "that the expenditure out of the balances in anticipation of Parliamentary authority has been both irregular and objectionable," and they repeat that "the plea of urgency cannot be admitted as an excuse for such proceedings." Again, we find it reported that the unauthorised advances made out of balances have amounted to £890,000, and that the power of making such advances is *still practically uncontrolled*. The italics are ours, but the words so marked show that there are considerable openings for all kinds of improper schemes, where any department can advance money for any purpose whatever, without the needful control which should confine public funds to their appropriate channel.

It will then be interesting to know the opinion of the Committee on this public office, whose actions are, or were until very recently, practically uncontrolled. It is in these words "As to the National Debt Office. The Committee could not but conclude, from the evidence before them in March, that the National Debt Commissioners were constantly kept informed of the sums due to them by the Post Office. This appears, on further inquiry, to be an error, and they allege that they have no power under the statute (the Telegraph Act, 1869) to inquire into or call for the balances which may be due to them from time to time, and that there is no official information at their disposal, except the annual statement, which is laid before Parliament about three months after date. Nevertheless, the fact is that the present Comptroller of the National Debt Office wrote immediately on his appointment, on the 27th of March last, to the Postmaster-General, requiring an account and transfer of the balances due, and within three days a sum of £430,000 was paid over accordingly. On the whole, it can scarcely be doubted that the National Debt Office ought to have observed the growing irregularity with which, for some years, these payments had been made, and, notably, the short payments of 1870, as compared with those of 1869, the difference between them being about £400,000, while it was notorious that the business had been, from the first, constantly improving; and the Committee agree with the Chancellor of the Exchequer that, considering the intimate relations which subsist between the Treasury and the National Debt Office, it fell within the general duty and functions of the latter to have long since drawn the attention of the former and superior authority to the fact that these balances were not made over to them with precision and regularity, as during the early years after the Act came into operation."

When it was proposed in Parliament that the funds belonging to the suitors of the Court should be handed over bodily to the Treasury, we were entertained with the statement that they would have the security of the Consolidated Fund, and that they would in that respect be better off than before. Formerly these funds were under the control of the Accountant-General of the Court, who, as an officer of the Court, only acted under its direction, and who was sufficiently checked, not only by the suitors themselves, as their funds were from time to time brought under review, a check which still exists, but by a duplicate set of accounts which the Bank of England, as bankers for the Court, kept continually posted up, and compared once a-year with the books at the offices of the Court.

The effect of recent legislation has been, as we have shown, to reduce the funds of the suitors to mere balances on paper, secured, it may be admitted, in an undeniable manner, but, as now appears, subject to the uncontrolled devices of those who are set to take charge of them.

Without wishing to excite uneasiness we do venture to hope that the reform which is taking place in the administration of the National Debt Office, so far as regards the funds derived from the Post Office, will be extended to guard the due administration of the money of Chancery suitors, and that a proper and sufficient check will be devised which will prevent any such untoward event as would happen should the necessary payments not be forthcoming when called for. When the Court had the sole control it was possible to believe that sufficient stock and cash existed to meet the whole liabilities; but under a system of uncontrolled dealing with the money of private individuals no one will know what to believe unless sufficient safeguards are provided.

Since the above was in type Mr. Gladstone has given Mr. Cross the morning sitting of the House on Tuesday next for the purpose of bringing on his question with respect to the telegraph service, and it is just possible that some other member may see fit to bring forward the subject of the Chancery suitors' funds at the same time.

TREASURY ALLOWANCES FOR PROSECUTIONS.

The result of the withdrawal of the Public Prosecutor's Bill is that this session will pass by without anything being done in the matter of the allowances of costs in criminal prosecutions. We are almost ashamed to return to a subject which we have noticed so often, and every aspect of which must be so familiar to our readers. Still it must be noticed from time to time, or nothing will ever be done, and but few days pass without the disclosure of some fresh instance of injustice caused by the present system. Thus the prosecuting attorneys in a murder case wrote last week to the *Times* pointing out the absurd insufficiency of the sum allowed to them—8s. 10d.—after paying actually necessary costs. Again, at the Maidstone Assizes on Tuesday last, the prosecuting counsel in a rape case accounted for the absence of the doctor who had examined the woman immediately after the occurrence, by suggesting that his expenses would not have been allowed. In this he was probably mistaken; but, as we have often pointed out, the mischief done by the present system of arbitrary disallowance after costs have been incurred, is that prosecutors are deterred from incurring expenses which would really be allowed to them, by the uncertainty whether they will or not.

At the risk of wearying our readers, we will just repeat how the facts stand. The Court of Queen's Bench have declared in the most emphatic manner that there is no justification for the practice of the Treasury in disallowing costs taxed by the proper officer, and that

it is entirely unwarranted. A *mandamus* to the Lords of the Treasury was only refused on the ground that the duty neglected by them was a duty to the Crown, and not a duty to the persons to whom the money was payable. It might have been thought that this decision of the Court would have resulted in the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury commencing to do the duty which it was pointed out that they owed to the Crown and to Parliament. But they did not do so, excusing themselves by saying that in their opinion supervision was required, and therefore the duty ought to be neglected, that the whole matter was under the consideration of the Home Secretary, and that they proposed to apply to Parliament for powers over the taxation and allowance of costs. On the understanding that this would be done, and done promptly, Sir Massey Lopes, who had frequently brought the matter forward in the House of Commons, allowed it to drop for a time. All that has been done has been to insert clauses on the subject in the Public Prosecutor's Bill, but no serious effort was made to pass that Bill, and it has been now withdrawn. Under these circumstances, the Government, not having redeemed their pledge to get the law altered so as to justify them in the course they have been taking, ought at once to conform with the law as declared by the Queen's Bench.

We had hoped that some declaration to this effect would be made by the Government, but we regret to see that the Home Secretary has on Thursday last answered a question on the subject in a manner which shows that he does not in the least understand the effect of his system. He says it is *impossible* that the supervision should be discontinued. Considering that the supervision has been pronounced unjustifiable, and is, moreover, a practice of quite recent date, we fail to see the impossibility of discontinuing it. He went on to say that he had directed that the supervision should be exercised with due consideration, and that there had been no recent complaints. No amount of subsequent consideration on the part of the supervisors will tell prosecutors beforehand what will be allowed. The present grievance is that prosecutions are now often improperly got up; and that where they are properly got up, the costs of them are often improperly disallowed by the local taxing officers, in consequence of the uncertainty which prevails as to what the result will be of the subsequent arbitrary and illegal taxation at the Treasury by officers who know nothing of the circumstances of the case. The Home Secretary is wrong in saying that there have been no recent complaints of this nature. He may be right in saying that there have been no recent complaints of the Treasury officials, but this is because the local taxing officers have now got frightened of them, and do the mischief themselves.

NOTES.

A remarkable letter on the subject of International Arbitration from a distinguished Frenchman, M. Ch. Lucas, member of the Institute, has appeared in the *Times*. M. Lucas has ascertained that the practical application of the principle dates from 1783, from which time to the present there have been twenty-two successful arbitrations. The first and last of these were between England and the United States. M. Lucas suggests that this country and the United States should establish the principle of International Arbitration by a formal treaty entered into for that purpose, and that they should throw their authority and the weight of their precedent into a protocol to which they should invite the adhesion, by signature, of other nations.

In the recent inquiry into the condition of the Civil Service in Ireland considerable attention was directed to the incomes of professional men. With regard to the Irish lawyers, a Dublin solicitor, who was one of the witnesses examined, said there was a very large number of solicitors making from £200 to £500 a year, but very few making £1,000 a year. It appears that it is a common thing for an articled clerk, when his articles are out, to continue in the office as a salaried clerk. The witness to whom we have referred was himself paying a solicitor in his office £200 a year, another £2 a week, and two or three 30s. a week. A Queen's Counsel thought that there were not more than one or two men at the Irish Bar making £4,000 a year; that there were five or six making £3,000, about 20 making £2,000 and a considerable number making £1,500. A fair number make £1,000 a year, but a much larger number make less. An Irish barrister does not generally have to bear the expense of "chambers;" briefs are sent to his house.

COURTS.

THE EUROPEAN ASSURANCE SOCIETY ARBITRATION.*

(Before Lord WESTBURY.)

Feb. 4.—*European Assurance Society.—Manisty's case. Life Assurance Company—Powers of Directors—Shareholder—Payments of calls—Forfeiture of shares.*

Directors of a company have no right to use the powers entrusted to them, except for the benefit of all the shareholders, and for the purpose for which they were given.

Therefore, where directors, desiring to benefit a solvent shareholder, relieved him of his shares, by virtue of a power they possessed to forfeit shares on which default had been made in the payment of calls; it was held that, although there were calls unpaid upon the shares, and the shareholder was not a party to the act of the directors, it was a collusive forfeiture from which he could reap no benefit, and that his name must be placed on the list of contributories.

By the 22nd clause of the deed of settlement of the European Assurance Society, it was provided: "That in case any instalment or call upon any share or shares in the company shall (either in the whole or in part) remain unpaid for the space of two calendar months after the day fixed for payment in the circular letter and advertisement giving notice thereof, the board of directors may at any time or times after the expiration of such two calendar months declare that the share or shares in respect of which default in payment has been so made, or any of them, is or are forfeited, and that whether the instalment or instalments due or owing shall or shall not have been sued for, and whether any action or actions, suit or suits, in respect thereof shall or shall not be actually pending; and the same share or shares, and all sums, and every sum paid thereon, and all benefit or advantage whatsoever attending the same shall, upon the declaration of such forfeiture, become and be forfeited to the company, and the board of directors may thereupon, or at any time afterwards, at their discretion, proceed to sell such shares, either together or separately, and either by public auction or by private contract, or in any other manner as they may think advisable; and such share or shares when sold shall, without any further act, be registered in the name of the purchaser or purchasers thereof respectively, and such share or shares shall, until sold or disposed of, or re-issued by the board of directors under the power for that purpose herein contained, sink and be extinguished, and be treated in the like manner as if the same had never been subscribed for or taken. Provided, nevertheless, that the board of directors may, at their discretion, discharge any forfeited share or shares, or any of them, whether forfeited under this or any other provision in these presents, from forfeiture, and restore the same to the proprietors or proprietor thereof, on such terms as the board may think proper. Provided, also, that nothing herein contained shall prevent the board from enforcing the payment of any instalment or call, instalments or calls, due on any such share or shares, notwithstanding such forfeiture."

The 39th clause provided as follows:—"That it shall be lawful for the board of directors, from time to time, as to them shall appear necessary or expedient, to appoint any person or persons separately, or any number of persons collectively, either from their own body or not, and with such qualification respectively (if any) as to the said board shall seem fit, at any place or places either in Great Britain or Ireland, or beyond the seas, whether within or without the Queen's dominions, to be an agent or agents, or a local committee, or local board of direction of the com-

* Reported by W. BOUSFIELD, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

pany, for the purpose of managing, transacting, or prosecuting at or in such place or places, the objects, business, or purposes of the said company, or any of them, or of performing any special services whatsoever which the objects and business of the company may from time to time appear to the said board to require; and the board of directors may, and shall give unto, and confer upon any such agent or agents, or local committee, or local board of direction, all or any of the powers and authorities hereby given to the board of directors (being legally conferable) as they the said directors shall think requisite or expedient, and from time to time, or at any time, such agent or agents, or all or any of the members of any such local committee, or local board of direction respectively, to remove and appoint another or others; and also to revoke, rescind, suspend, or curtail all and every, or any of the powers and authorities which may be so given and conferred; and also to allow or pay to any such agent or agents, or the members of any such local committee, or local board of direction respectively, such remuneration for their respective services out of the funds of the said company as they, the said directors, shall think proper."

The 64th clause provided as follows:—"That, without prejudice to the powers hereinafter given to the general meetings of shareholders, the board of directors shall have the entire management and superintendence of the affairs and concerns of the company, and shall in all cases provided for by these presents, or to be provided for by resolutions passed at general meetings of shareholders as hereinafter mentioned, act in conformity to the rules and regulations hereby established, or hereafter to be established. But in all cases for the time being unprovided for by these presents, or by resolutions passed at the general meetings of shareholders, it shall be lawful for the board to act in such manner as shall appear to them best calculated to promote the welfare of the company, and to do and execute all such acts, matters, and things as may be deemed necessary or expedient for any such purpose; and for the better government of their body it shall be lawful for a board, specially called for the purpose, to make whatever rules they shall think proper, provided the same be not inconsistent with or repugnant to the provisions of the Act 7 & 8 Vict. c. 110 and of these presents as now framed, or as at any time hereafter to be altered, by virtue of the powers hereinafter given, and at any time to alter or repeal all or any of the rules for the time being in force."

In the year 1864 the directors of the society in London established a branch of the society with a branch board of directors at Bombay, and made the following regulations (*inter alia*) as to their constitution:—"That the branch board shall consist of not less than three, nor more than seven directors, two to be a quorum, and the qualification of each member shall be the holding in his own name of not less than fifty shares of the society," and "That the whole proceedings of the branch board must be in strict accordance with the terms, conditions, and provisions of the deed of settlement of the society."

In the year 1869 Mr. Manisty was one of the directors at the branch board at Bombay, and held fifty partly paid-up shares in the society. In that year petitions were presented in the Court of Chancery to wind up the society, and in consequence nearly all the Bombay directors became anxious to resign their offices, and considerable correspondence took place between some of them and the London directors as to their being relieved from liability on their shares. In July and December, 1869, and in March, 1870, calls of five shillings per share were made on all shares of the society; but Mr. Manisty did not pay these calls. In April, 1870, the London directors formally revoked the powers of attorney granted to the board at Bombay. Much pressure continued to be put upon the London directors to relieve the Bombay directors of their shares, and in August, 1870, the solicitors of the society advised that this might be done by a transfer from the Bombay directors at the price of the day to some third parties, by having the shares registered, so as to relieve them from having their names kept upon the list of members, and by returning the value paid for their shares in cash, and entering the amount in the books of the society as compensation or bonus for service rendered. This plan was, however, not adopted; but at a meeting of the London directors, on the 23rd August, 1870, it was resolved, that the clause in the constitution of the Bombay branch relating to the qualification of directors should be cancelled; and further resolutions were passed, which were entered in the minute book of the board in these terms:—"Under the advice of Messrs. Richardson & Sadler, solicitors of the society, it was resolved, that the calls due upon the shares held by the following gentlemen, now or lately directors of the society's branches in Bombay and Calcutta, not having been paid, the said shares, according to the numbers set opposite each name, are, in terms of the 22nd clause of the society's deed of settlement, declared to be and are hereby cancelled." The names of the Indian directors and the number of their shares here followed, Mr. Manisty's name and fifty shares appearing among them. "Under the advice of Messrs. Richardson & Sadler, solicitors of the society, it was also resolved, that a sum not exceeding £128 15s. be allowed to," Manisty and other directors, "for special services rendered in connection with the Indian branches."

These resolutions were communicated to the Bombay directors, and £128 15s., as remuneration, was divided among Mr. Manisty and his co-directors at Bombay. This amount nearly represented what had been paid by them for their shares.

On the 17th July, 1871, Mr. Manisty resigned his position as director. No application to the London directors was ever made by him to be relieved of liability upon his shares. He had no knowledge of the advice given by the solicitors of the society, and always believed that his shares were forfeited solely for non-payment of calls, and that the payment to him and his co-directors was made *bonâ fide* as a reward for their services.

In January, 1872, the European Society was ordered to be wound up, and the joint official liquidator now contended that the forfeiture of Mr. Manisty's fifty shares was not a *bonâ fide* forfeiture authorised by the deed of settlement of the society, and that his name ought to be placed on the list of contributories in respect of the shares.

Higgins, Q.C. (*Cookson* with him), for the Joint Official Liquidator of the European Society.

Whitehorne, for Mr. Manisty.

Lord WESTBURY.—The shareholders in this company, by he official liquidators, complain that the directors of the company improperly released Mr. Manisty from his co-iability with them in respect of his fifty shares. No doubt the directors were animated by a good motive in doing what they did. They received very bad advice but they do not seem to have followed it; and it does not appear, so far as Mr. Manisty is concerned, that any kind of imputation rests upon him. The directors believed that they could accomplish their object by the use of a power of transfer contained in the deed. They resorted to that power for the purpose of effecting a benefit for their friend Mr. Manisty. But the power in question was never intended to be made the instrument for carrying out such a collusive transaction. The transaction becomes collusive, although made without the concurrence of Mr. Manisty, when he claims the benefit of it. A power of forfeiture contained in a deed like this is intended to be exercised when there is an actual *bonâ fide* refusal by a shareholder, or an actual *bonâ fide* neglect to pay the calls that have been made upon him, and then the directors are warranted, if they think fit, in forfeiting the shares of the failing or delinquent shareholder. But Mr. Manisty was not in that position, and the directors knew very well that he never would have been, and that he never was intended to be, but they pretend that the calls were due from him, which in reality was contrary to the fact. They pretend that he has made default in payment of those calls, which they knew was not the truth, and they represent him as a man against whom they had to take adverse proceedings, and who, by reason of his refusal to recognise his liability to the company, had brought himself within the words of the clause of forfeiture. They use, therefore, the words of that clause to the letter, but not in conformity with the truth. That has been denominated by courts of equity, which have been very wisely careful upon these matters, as a misuse of the power. Sometimes it is denominated a fraud upon the power, because, in point of fact, fraud comes under the old definition *aliud actum, aliud simulatum*. Here the *aliud simulatum* was the pretence of Mr. Manisty being a defaulting shareholder, which in reality he was not; but he was dealt with as if he had been, whereas the directors

knew that they were putting upon him a character which was at variance with the truth. He cannot hold the benefit so acquired, simply for this reason, that the persons who endeavoured to give it to him through the medium of this power had no right to do so; they had no right to rob the other shareholders of the benefit of the co-liability of Mr. Manisty, and using the power for that purpose was, in point of fact, a misappropriation, and a destruction of so much of the property of the other shareholders. The same contrivance might have been carried to the extent of releasing the proprietor of 1,000 or 2,000 or 5,000 shares. The vice of the thing lies in this, that the directors have taken upon themselves to release a shareholder, who was jointly liable with the other shareholders, and in that respect, unjustly to deprive the other shareholders of the benefit of his contribution. A gift so made, and having that effect, is a gift which Mr. Manisty is not at liberty to accept, although the appropriation of the gift, the notion of it, and the carrying it into effect, were matters with which he had no concern, and of which possibly he never dreamt. He must be restored to the register as the proprietor of fifty shares. I shall not make Mr. Manisty pay the costs of this matter, and the costs of the liquidator will come out of the estate.

Solicitors, *Mercer & Mercer; H. Ramsden.*

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Registrar MURRAY, sitting as Chief Judge.)

June 17.—*Re Dummiloe.*

R. recovered a verdict against D. in an action for money paid, but before judgment D. filed a petition for liquidation, and an injunction was obtained to restrain the proceedings in the action. R. applied to prove and to vote under D.'s liquidation for the amount of debt, and also an estimated amount of untaxed costs.

Held, that, although R. might prove and vote in respect of the debt, he could not do so in respect of costs, the amount of which had not been ascertained by taxation.

This was an appeal from an order of Mr. Registrar Keene, refusing to register a resolution of creditors under a petition for liquidation.

The real question involved was whether Henry Ruffles, a creditor of the debtor, was entitled to prove and vote, not only for £327, the amount of his debt, but also for £200, the estimated amount of his costs.

The facts were that Ruffles brought an action against the debtor for money paid, and upon the trial of the cause at Kingston a verdict was found for the plaintiff, £300 to be paid into court, and the cause to be referred to Mr. Cohen.

The debtor, before judgment, filed a petition for liquidation by arrangement, and an injunction was obtained restraining proceedings in the action.

The debtor did not deny that something was due for costs, but he alleged not nearly so large a sum as £200 could properly be claimed.

The debtor in his statement of affairs returned Mr. Ruffles as a creditor for £327.

Mr. Registrar Keene allowed Ruffles' proof for £327 debt, and £200 estimated amount of costs; and Ruffles having voted against the resolution proposed at the first meeting, the Registrar held that the statutory majority had not been obtained. The debtor appealed.

Ellis J. Davis, for the appellant.—The creditor in this case not having signed judgment for the costs he cannot prove; without the allocatur it is impossible to say what the costs are. The object of the 31st section of the Act is to allow proof in respect of a liability: *Ex parte Llynvi Coal, &c., Company, Re Hide*, 20 W. R. 105, L. R. 7 Ch. 28; but the amount must be ascertained. He also referred to *Ex parte Peacock, Re Duffield*, 21 W. R. 755.

W. P. Macdonald, for the respondent.—The amount of the costs may be ascertained without taxation: the creditor gives an "estimate," which is sufficient: see 31st section of the Act. We could not tax the costs on account of the injunction.

MURRAY, Registrar.—Of course I do not for a moment say that these costs are not proveable. But the question is whether, at the meetings which have been held under the liquidation, the creditor had put himself in such a position, as to get the proof admitted for the debt which is now claimed and the costs—whether the creditor was entitled to vote at the meeting in respect of the costs, having regard to the 16th section, 3rd sub-section, and also to the provisions of the 31st section. I am of opinion that he was not entitled to prove for the costs. The answer to the objection in reference to the injunction is that the creditor, upon being served with notice, might have appeared and have asked for leave to tax his costs. This the Court would have had authority to allow under the 13th section.

Solicitor for the appellant, *Noton.*

Solicitor for the respondent, *W. Beck.*

COUNTY COURTS.

BRADFORD.

(Before Mr. W. T. S. DANIEL, Q.C., Judge.)

July 4.—*Ex parte Buckley, In re Waddington.*

Jurisdiction of bankruptcy courts—Act of bankruptcy—Notice.

In April W. executed a bill of sale of part of his effects with intent to defeat his creditors, thereby committing an act of bankruptcy. In June H. who, six months before, had sold W. three machines, agreed, as W. could not pay for them, to take them back. He accordingly removed one of them, and left the other two on the premises, where, at his request, they were put up for sale by auction on the 9th August. One was sold and removed by the purchaser, and H. received the purchase-money. The other was bought in by H., and left on the premises until after he had notice of a petition for liquidation, filed by W. on the 15th August. H. had no notice of the bill of sale until after the arrangement for his taking the machines back, nor until after he had removed one of them, and when he had such notice he had no reason to suspect that it was an act of bankruptcy.

Held, that as to the machine removed by H., and the machine removed by the purchaser, H.'s title must prevail; but that as to the machine left on W.'s premises, and not removed until after H. had notice of the petition for liquidation, the trustee's title must prevail.

His HONOUR to-day gave judgment in this case, which had been argued at a previous sitting of the Court, when Mr. Watson, of the firm of Messrs. Watson & Dickons, appeared for the trustee, and Mr. A. W. Robinson, of the firm of Messrs. Terry & Robinson, for the respondent.

The facts appear from the judgment.

His HONOUR (after discussing the question of the jurisdiction of the Court under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, as against persons not parties to the bankruptcy, and expressing an opinion that the recent case of *Ellis* v. *Silber* is not, in any way, inconsistent with *Ex parte Anderson*, 18 W. R. 715, L. R. 5 Ch. 473, and coming to the conclusion that the Court had jurisdiction to deal with such a case as the present) delivered judgment as follows:—

This is a motion on behalf of Charles Joseph Buckley, the trustee under the liquidation of Eleazar Waddington, machine maker, Bradford, that William Hopkinson, machine broker, Bradford, may be ordered to pay to the trustee the sum of £47 10s., the amount paid to him by the debtor or by his direction in the month of August last, and the further sum of £51, the value of certain machinery the effects of the debtor, and in his order and disposition, and delivered to Hopkinson by the debtor, on the ground that such payment and delivery were fraudulent preferences, and that at the time of such payment and delivery Hopkinson had notice of an act of bankruptcy committed by the debtor, and available against him for adjudication, and that Mr. Hopkinson may pay the costs of the application. Assuming that the Court has jurisdiction in this matter I proceed to dispose of the case upon the merits. The facts appear to be as follows:—Early in December, 1871, Hopkinson, the respondent, who is a machine broker in Bradford, sold and delivered to the debtor, Eleazar Waddington, three machines for £85, to be paid for at the end of six months, with interest in the meantime at 5 per cent. per annum; and as security for this payment Hopkinson received from the debtor the joint and several promissory note of himself and his son-in-law Benjamin Petty. In June, 1872, the six months having expired, Hopkinson applied to the debtor and Petty for payment of the promissory note. The debtor was not able to pay, and offered Hopkinson the machines back again, which he agreed to take. He stated as his reason for doing so, that as machinery of that description was rising in value he thought he should be able to make more of them. Petty,

the surety, was party to this arrangement, and assented to it, and its effect was clearly to discharge him from all liability on the note. As between Hopkinson and the debtor the effect of the transaction was a rescission of the contract and the revesting of the property in the machines in Hopkinson. One of the machines was removed by Hopkinson about a week afterwards. The other two remained on the premises occupied by the debtor until they were sold under the circumstances hereafter stated. The premises where the debtor carried on his business of a machine maker consisted of a room and power, which he rented of Hillers at a rent of 8s. a week. Hillers was cognisant of the arrangement between Hopkinson and the debtor, and that the two machines were left for the convenience of Hopkinson, because they were large and heavy machines, and he had not the means at that time of removing and storing them. It appears that previously to this arrangement the debtor had executed a bill of sale dated the 24th April, 1872, to Benjamin Broadbent for securing £250, and interest at 6 per cent. This bill of sale comprised certain specific chattels, including the three machines in question. The bill of sale was duly registered on the 27th April, and upon the face of it was a valid security for what was stated to be a present advance. A question has been raised as to whether Mr. Hopkinson had notice of the bill of sale at the time he made the arrangement with the debtor for the rescission of the contract. He denies notice at that time, and says that he first heard of the bill about the time he removed the first machine. He was told by the debtor that the bill of sale did not include any of the three machines, but he was shortly afterwards told that it did, and the debtor then admitted it, and the fact was so. It appears to me, however, immaterial to consider this question in the view I take of the case as between Hopkinson and the trustee. If the question had arisen between Hopkinson and the bill of sale creditor, I apprehend the title of the latter would have prevailed against Hopkinson, whether he had had notice or not, inasmuch as assuming the bill of sale to be what, upon the face of it, it purports to be, a security for a present advance of £250, duly registered, the title of the creditor to the goods assigned would be complete at law, and he could have recovered them from Hopkinson if required to satisfy his security. But no question ever arose between Hopkinson and Broadbent. What happened was this: The debtor at the latter end of July, 1872, gave instructions to Mr. Buckley Sharp, an auctioneer in Bradford, to sell his stock-in-trade and effects by auction. Mr. Sharp has made an affidavit, and has also been examined *viva voce* before me, and I take the facts I am about to state from the evidence thus given. Having received these instructions from the debtor, Mr. Sharp on the 30th July, went to the defendant's premises to inspect the articles to be sold so as to prepare a catalogue. On that occasion the defendant pointed out all the articles on the premises as his, except two machines which he said belonged to Hopkinson, and on the following day Hopkinson saw Sharp, and gave Sharp instructions to sell the machines for him, and Sharp undertook to do so. The goods were duly advertised for sale, and these machines were included in the catalogue as lots 28, 29 and 33. There was no distinction made in the catalogue as to the ownership of these goods, but all the goods sold were treated at the sale as the goods of the debtor, and Sharp stated that it was an usual and common practice to include in sales by auction goods of a third party without mentioning the ownership, and that to have mentioned the separate ownership in this case would have damaged the sale both of Waddington's goods and Hopkinson's, and I have no doubt that as regards both Sharp and Hopkinson they were acting in good faith. Sharp had been told by Waddington, on the 30th July, of the bill of sale, but stated that his attorney said he might sell. The sale was advertised for, and took place on, the 9th August. On the morning of that day, and before the sale, Burnley, the clerk to Harle, acting as Broadbent's attorney, objected to the sale going on without an undertaking from Sharp to pay the amount claimed to be due under the bill of sale. Sharp obtained Waddington's authority to give the undertaking; he gave it, and the sale proceeded. The total proceeds were £562 16s. They included £66 10s., the proceeds of the two machines in question, and Sharp's commission upon them. One machine was sold for £38, and was removed and paid for by the purchaser, and the proceeds paid by Sharp to Hopkinson. The other (lot 33) was bought in by Hopkinson for £26, and remained upon the debtor's premises until after the petition for liquidation was filed, and was subsequently removed by Hopkinson. After the hearing of the petition, the balance, after deducting the £66 10s., amounting to £496 6s., was accounted for by Sharp to Waddington, on the 16th August, the sum of £257 5s. 7d., the amount claimed to be due on the bill of sale having been paid thereout on the 12th August by Waddington's order to Burnley, the clerk of Harle, acting as Broadbent's attorney, on his account and in satisfaction of Sharp's undertaking. On the 15th August, Waddington, acting by a different solicitor, who was ignorant of his former proceedings, filed a petition for liquidation in this Court under which Buckley was, on the 20th September, 1873, appointed trustee by resolution duly registered on the 24th September. The proceedings under the liquidation have brought to light the fact that the bill of sale to Broadbent and the sale by auction were frauds by Waddington on his general creditors. The proceeds of the auction sale were nearly exhausted by payments made by Waddington, or by his authority to persons, who, if creditors at all, which is very doubtful as to some at least, were creditors fraudulently preferred. Thus the sale itself, having regard to the object which it now appears Waddington had in the application of the proceeds, was a fraudulent disposition of his property and an act of bankruptcy; for it appears that instructions for the petition for liquidation were given by Waddington's wife by his authority a week before it was signed and presented, and during the interval the proceeds of the sale were received and misapplied by Waddington, or under his direction and authority. It does not however appear that either Hopkinson or Sharp had any notice or ground of suspicion that Waddingson's proceedings as to the sale were fraudulent, or otherwise than *bonâ fide*. The balance of the sale moneys, £25 17s. 8d., was not paid over by Sharp to Waddington until the 16th August, after the presentation of the petition; but Sharp deposed before me, and I give credit to his statement, that he had no notice of the petition at the time he paid the balance, and in fact did not hear of it until a week afterwards. As regards Broadbent's title, under the bill of sale of the 24th April, 1873, the payment of the £257 5s. 7d., the amount claimed to be due to him thereon, was first challenged by the trustee as a fraudulent preference, but the facts appearing upon the affidavits and examinations filed, and taken with reference to that question, showed that the payment was made under pressure, and therefore not fraudulent.

The same evidence however gave rise to the question whether the bill of sale was a *bonâ fide* security for a *bonâ fide* advance of money. I considered that under the circumstances as appearing on the affidavit and examinations, that was a question proper to be tried and determined by a jury, and I directed an issue for that purpose, the issue being whether the bill of sale was fraudulent. That issue was tried before me on the 25th February and the 14th March last, and after a full inquiry the jury found that the bill of sale was fraudulent, the ground of objection taken by the trustee, and which the jury by their verdict adopted, being that there was no *bonâ fide* loan of £250 or any other sum at any time by Broadbent to Waddington; and that the bill of sale was a mere device by Waddington to protect his property against his creditors to the extent of £250. This verdict has not been questioned by Broadbent, and he has been since ordered to refund the £257 5s. 7d. That order is still in force, and its propriety has not been questioned. The effect of this verdict, finding the bill of sale fraudulent, is of course to declare it an act of bankruptcy, and make the title of the trustee relate back to its date, the 24th April, and thus overreach the transaction for the rescission of the contract upon which Hopkinson relies (and which did not take place till the June following) if Hopkinson had at the time notice of the bill of sale as an act of bankruptcy available for adjudication, and this is the ground stated in the notice of motion. Hopkinson insists that he had no notice of the bill of sale until a fortnight after he made the arrangement with Waddington, and had actually removed one of the machines, and that when he had notice of the bill of sale he had no notice

that it was an act of bankruptcy. I think this contention on the part of Hopkinson is right. Not having been a party to the issue as to the validity of the bill of sale, he is not bound by the verdict of the jury or the proceedings against Broadbent that have followed upon it. As regards Hopkinson the trial and verdict were *res inter alios acta*. The bill of sale is good upon the face of it. It purports to be a security by a trader upon specific portions of his stock-in-trade and effects in consideration of a present advance of £250 and further advances to the extent of £400 in the whole. It was duly executed and attested by the clerk of a respectable solicitor in Bradford (Mr. Green), and was duly registered on the 27th April, three days after its date. There was nothing upon the face of the document to excite the slightest suspicion of its fairness or validity. If Hopkinson had procured an office copy of the deed and had taken independent professional advice upon it, I am at a loss to see any ground upon which he could have been advised to question or doubt its validity. Nay, further, it appears from the affidavits on the file that if he had gone to Mr. Green, in whose office the bill of sale was prepared, he would have been told by him that although no money was paid at the time of the execution, he (Mr. Green) had no doubt the money was advanced, and that the transaction was in every respect *bona fide*; as I have the fullest confidence Mr. Green believed it to be. The fraud which the jury have considered to be proved was a fraud which must have been concocted between Waddington and Broadbent (probably with the concurrence and co-operation of some members of Waddington's family) which Waddington would be careful to conceal from his own legal adviser. It was only through such concealment that such a fraud could have been perpetrated. For had Mr. Green known or suspected the fraud he would not have prepared the deed, or permitted it to be prepared and completed in his office. If, then, the attorney who is responsible for the deed had no suspicion of the latent fraud which made it an act of bankruptcy, why should Hopkinson have any suspicion about the matter? Mr. Watson, for the trustee, relied upon the case of *Topping* v. *Keysell*, 12 W. R, 756, as an authority for the proposition that notice of a bill of sale which is an act of bankruptcy is notice of an act of bankruptcy. In that case Chief Justice Erle said, "I think that he (the creditor) knew of the bill of sale, and that knowing of it he knew of an act of bankruptcy." And in the same case Mr. Justice Willes said, "When defendant called and asked for payment of what was due to him, he was informed of the bill of sale, and it seems to me quite clear that notice of that bill of sale was notice of an act of bankruptcy." But in that case the bill of sale was of the whole substantially of the debtor's effects to secure a past debt. Though as Mr. Justice Willes observes the deed appears to have been framed with the object of making it appear valid, for it recited that the debtor had applied to the creditor for more goods; but no further goods were supplied, and only four days after the execution of the bill of sale, the creditor demanded payment of his debt and sold up the debtor, and the learned judge treated the bill of sale as substantially an assignment of all the trader's property to secure a past debt. This character of the bill of sale the creditor, in that case having notice of it, might have ascertained by examining the bill of sale and inquiring into the circumstances attending it. In the same case, however, Mr. Justice Willes, in the course of the argument referred to, and adopted Lord Wensleydale's decision in *Hope* v. *Meek*, 4 W. R. C. L. Dig. 141, 10 Ex. 829, as to what is sufficient notice of an act of bankruptcy, defining it "to be any communication which brings to the knowledge of the creditor before his title accrues the alleged fact that an act of banruptcy has been committed in any way which ought to induce him to believe, as a reasonable man, that the notification is true." Adopting that definition in its integrity, it appears to me to be inapplicable to Hopkinson under the circumstances of this case. Having notice of the bill of sale to Broadbent, he had notice of a transaction which, upon the face of it, was valid and complete, and with reference to which no suspicion of fraud attached or could have been entertained by any reasonable man. Two other cases (*Ex parte Lewis*, *In re Henderson*, 19 W. R. 835, L. R. 6 Ch. 626, and *Ex parte Eyles*, *In re Edwards*, 21 W. R. 574) were also cited on behalf of the trustee. *Lewis's case* turned upon the question what was a sufficient taking possession to make an unregistered bill of sale good under the Bills of Sale Act, and has no application to the present case. *Ex parte Eyles* turned upon the effect of the relation back of the title of the trustee as against an execution creditor who had levied but not completed his title by sale, and there the bill of sale was for an antecedent debt and upon the face of it an act of bankruptcy, but I can't collect from the short note of the judgment whether the judge attributed any weight to the fact that the creditor had no notice of the act of bankruptcy before the seizure. Considering that in the present case the order asked against Hopkinson is founded expressly upon the fact that he had notice of an act of bankruptcy committed by Waddington, and available for adjudication against him so as to cover the whole transaction as to the three machines, I am of opinion that the evidence fails to establish the fact of such notice, and that the transaction of June, 1872, amounting, as in my view of the evidence it did, to a rescission of the contract was, so far as it was completed by delivery and change of possession, a contract or dealing with Waddington, made in good faith and for valuable consideration, and is protected by section 94, subsection 3 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, and was also a disposition or contract with respect to the disposition of property by transfer and delivery of goods made by the bankrupt in good faith and for valuable consideration within the protection of section 95, subsection 1 of the same Act.

As to the machine that was taken away by Hopkinson shortly after the arrangement in June, I am of opinion his title is clear. As to the two other machines—so far as any question of leaving the goods in the order and disposition of Waddington could be raised, I think that the acts both of Waddington and Hopkinson, in the representation made by the one as to the ownership of those machines, and the directions given by the other to Sharp as to the sale of them, and what was done by him in consequence, sufficiently displace any such question—and that as to the machine that was sold and removed by the purchaser, and the purchase-money for which has been paid and handed over to Hopkinson, his title is also clear—but as to the other machine which was bought in and not removed from the debtor's premises until recently and after Hopkinson had notice of the petition for liquidation I am of opinion the trustee's title must prevail—for although I hold that the transaction of June, 1872, was valid and effectual as against the prior title of the trustee under the act of bankruptcy committed by the execution of the bill of sale which the jury have decided to be fradulent, the transaction is valid and effectual only so far as it was completed by actual transfer, and possession taken under it without notice of any act of bankruptcy. And as Hopkinson permitted the third machine to remain on the debtor's premises until after the act of bankruptcy committed by filing the petition for liquidation, he, having notice of that act of bankruptcy, was not entitled then to remove it, because it was really the property of the trustees under a prior title, which though defeasible, had not been defeated. Hopkinson must therefore pay to the trustee the value of that machine, and this may be taken to be the sum at which it was bought in at the sale—namely, £26 There is also a further sum of £7 which Sharp paid Hopkinson out of the proceeds of the sale by Waddington's order. This, I think, must be treated as a payment made without pressure after Waddington had committed an act of bankruptcy and when he was insolvent, and therefore void as a fraudulent preference. The order, therefore, will be for payment by Hopkinson to the trustee of the sum of £33, but I make no order as to costs, as I entirely acquit Hopkinson of all complicity in the frauds of Waddington, and consider that his conduct throughout was *bona fide*, and no more than an honest endeavour on his part to regain his property by means which he was justified in believing, and did believe, were proper and legitimate. I have not omitted to consider the fact that Hopkinson retained possession of the promissory note until after the sale by Sharp, and then gave it to him to return to Waddington, but I do not consider the mere retention of the note would have the effect of preventing the transaction of June, 1872, being, as I have held it to be, a rescission of the original contract for the sale of the machinery, as the surety was a party to, and made cognisant of, the transaction, he was immediately discharged; and as against Waddington, the note became of no value in Hopkinson's hands for want of consideration, and Waddington might at any time have required its delivery from Hopkin-

son, but he never applied for it, and Hopkinson merely retained it, and did not attempt to negotiate it or make it in any way available against Waddington.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. JOHN MILLER, of Bristol, solicitor, has been appointed by the High Courts of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, and at Bombay, a Commissioner for taking affidavits, examinations, &c., in such courts, and for taking the acknowledgments of deeds, &c., by married women in England in respect of property in the East Indies.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

July 18.—*Conveyancing (Scotland) Bill.*—In Committee on this Bill, Lord Colonsay, in moving the omission of clause 3, said that the measure was an attempt to reconcile two things which were irreconcilable—namely, the alteration of tenure contained in the Bill and the preservation of the essential rights of superiors. The necessary effect of the proposed change would be to deter superiors from granting feus, and to drive them into granting leases instead—a very undesirable result. Before legislating he thought an inquiry ought to be instituted into the question whether it was or was not expedient to deal in the manner now proposed with the rights of superiors and vassals. After a conversation, the clause was omitted from the Bill without a division. The remaining clauses of the Bill were agreed to with amendments.

The *Exchequer Bonds* (£1,600,000) *Bill* and the *Treasury Fund Chest Bill* were read the second time.

Steam Threshing Machines Bill.—The Earl of Morley, in moving the second reading of this Bill, explained that its object was to prevent accidents arising in the working of those machines through their not being fenced. Last year twelve of those accidents had occured to women and children. The Bill required those machines to be duly fenced. The Duke of Buckingham thought that five or six months should be given for the putting up of the requisite fencing.—The Bill was read a second time.

The *Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Provisional Order No. 3 Bill* went through Committee.

The *Court of Queen's Bench (Ireland) Grand Juries Bill* was reported.

The *Highland Schools (Scotland) Bill* passed through Committee.

Gas and Water Works Facilities Act (1870) *Amendment Bill.*—This Bill having been read a third time, Lord Redesdale moved an amendment restricting the increase of rates to cases where the companies could prove that, in spite of careful economy, they were likely to incur a loss.—Earl Cowper urged they were entitled to increased rates insuring a dividend of five per cent. On a division the amendment was rejected by 13 to 9. The Bill then passed.

July 21.—*Royal Commission.*—The royal assent was given to the following Bills:—Canonries, Canada Loan Guarantee, Tithe Commutation Acts Amendment, Indian Railways Registration, National Debt Commissioners (Annuities), Sites for Places of Religious Worship, Railway and Canal Traffic, Public Works Loan Commissioners (School and Sanitary Loans), Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (Nos. 4, 5, and 6), Local Government Provisional Orders (Nos. 4 and 5).

Agricultural Children Bill.—The House considered an amendment made by the Commons in this Bill. When the Bill went down to the Commons it contained a clause empowering a farmer to give employment to boys who did not attend school and whom he might see idling on a roadside. The Commons disagreed to that.—The Marquis of Salisbury thought education as well as agriculture would be prejudiced by moving too fast in the cause of education, and he recommended their Lordships to adhere to the form of the Bill as it was sent down. The suggestion was adopted.

The *Exchequer Bonds* (£1,600,000) and the *Treasury Chest Fund Bill* passed through committee.

The *Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill* and the *Court of Queen's Bench (Ireland) (Grand Juries) Bill* were read the third time and passed.

The *Consolidated Fund, &c. (Permanent Charges Redemption) Bill*, the *Public Records (Ireland) Act* (1867) *Amendment Bill*, and the *Revising Barristers Bill* were read the second time.

The Commons' amendments in the *Intestates' Widows and Children Bill* were agreed to.

July 22.—*Lord Westbury.*—The Lord Chancellor, after some prefatory remarks, spoke as follows:—In respect of Lord Westbury I should be sorry to lose the opportunity of saying a very few words. I think he was a man of as brilliant natural powers as any man he has left behind him. He was a man, too, who, from his very great industry and energy in the application of those powers, had acquired a very great grasp and a large breadth of view in regard to the science of jurisprudence, to which his life was devoted. He had all the qualities of an eminent Judge. Personally, I have to say that in the earliest part of my professional career, I was indebted to him for notice and kindness. That was when I was young and obscure, and when notice and kindness from such a person were most valuable. I was also indebted to him when he became Lord Chancellor on my first introduction to public service, and further for his confidence during the whole time of our official connection. I was no unconcerned—I will not say spectator, because I was in some sense an actor in the parliamentary struggles connected with his retirement from office, and never had I the smallest doubt for a single moment as to his personal purity and his freedom from anything inconsistent with high public and private honour in regard to those transactions in which he was thought to have failed in vigilance. No doubt or suspicion ever crossed my mind, and I could not but feel pained more than I have ever yet up to this moment been able to express that it was considered necessary to visit him with censure, which, so far as any public grounds appeared, was due, in my judgment, not to him, but to others. From that time he accepted, in a dignified manner, the part in the judicial and other proceedings of your Lordships' House, nor did he ever that I am aware show any feeling of resentment against those who had thought it their duty to oppose him. During the whole of this session I have deeply lamented the want of that assistance which he would have given to your Lordship's deliberations in reference to the important measure which has passed through your Lordships' House. I regretted his absence more because I had reason to believe that there were some points of importance on which his opinion was not entirely the same as my own. But he was frank and kind and generous in communicating his views to me, and I need not say that those views were carefully considered; but his absence from your Lordships' House, especially in regard to the discussions on that Bill, was a great loss, and the fact that we never can have that assistance again is, I am sure, one which will be deeply regretted by all of your Lordships as well as by myself.—Lord Cairns also testified to the kindness he had received when a young man from Lord Westbury, and to the unvarying manner in which that kindness was ever after extended to him. In contemplation of Lord Westbury's great talents, people might be too apt to forget the kindness of heart which lay below those more splendid qualities.—Lord Hatherley acknowledged the kindliness with which, during his occupancy of the woolsack, Lord Westbury had treated him. He never understood that with relation to the circumstances attening Lord Westbury's retirement there was any stain upon his personal honour.

The Bishop of Winchester.—The Archbishop of Canterbury and other members of the House paid feeling tributes to the memory of this illustrious prelate.

Elementary Education.—The report of amendments on the *Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (No. 1) Bill* was brought up.—Earl Beauchamp moved an amendment to the first clause, the effect of which would be to postpone the operation of the Bill when it had become an Act of Parliament until the 1st of January, 1874. He said the Bill proposed to confer upon the London School Board power to put in force the Lands Clauses Act in order to the compulsory acquisition of cer-

tain sites. He complained that the London School Board had not made use of the vacant accommodation in existing schools, and that their estimate of the number of children requiring elementary education was an exaggerated one. He maintained that the Board were pursuing a policy tending seriously to cripple voluntary schools.—Lord Lawrence defended the Board.—The Marquis of Salisbury blamed the Board far their passion for building. He warned them against disregarding the feelings of those who cultivated the education field before there were boards to till it.—After remarks by the Duke of Cleveland, the Earl of Harrowby, and Viscount Eversley, the amendment was negatived.

July 24.—*Bills Forwarded a Stage.*—The Militia (Service, &c.) Bill passed through Committee. The Report of Amendments in the Conveyancing (Scotland) Bill was, after some amendments, agreed to. The Report of Amendments in the Petitions of Right (Ireland) Bill was agreed to. The Steam Threshing Machines Bill went through Committee, and was reported. The Medical Act Amendment (University of London) Bill went through Committee. The Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c., Bill was read a second time. The Exchequer Bonds (£1,600,000) Bill; the Treasury Chest Fund Bill; the Consolidated Fund, &c. (Permanent Charges), Redemption Bill; and the Military Manœuvres Bill went through Committee. The Elementary Provisional Order Confirmation (No. 1) Bill was read a third time and passed.

Extension Fisheries Bill.—This Bill was read a second time.

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill.—The Albert and European Arbitrations.—On the order of the day for the consideration of the amendments made by the House of Commons in this Bill, Lord Cairns requested permission to explain a matter personal to himself and connected with the late Lord Westbury. He referred to the arguments of the Prime Minister and Attorney-General on the question of the relation between future Lord Chancellors and the new Court of Appeal, and pointed out that in the course of those arguments a statement was made that Lord Westbury and himself had assumed, in their positions as ex-Chancellors, the transaction of private as distinguished from public business; and that this private business had interfered with the performance of their public duties, and that therefore legislation upon the subject for the future had become necessary. He explained the circumstances under which he had taken the London, Chatham and Dover Arbitration and the Albert Arbitration, and contended that the business was not private business, but public business of the most important character. He explained the circumstances under which Lord Westbury had accepted the European Arbitration; and showed that the discharge of the duties of the arbitrators had not interfered with their duties in the House of Lords. He complained that he had had no previous notice of the charges brought in the House of Commons; and asked why the same arguments had not been used in the House of Lords.—The Lord Chancellor thought that if the whole case had been before the minds of the Prime Minister and Attorney-General they would not have spoken as they did. It appeared to him that when Parliament thought fit to create new special courts with such enormous and unprecedented powers, it would be impossible that any persons could be intrusted with those powers except learned men who had the greatest judicial experience, and who, from the public opinion of their capacity as well as of their virtue, should obtain the confidence of the country. If those Acts passed at all, it was an indispensable condition that some such men as Lord Cairns and Lord Westbury should carry them out. He also admitted that when one of the Bills was in the House of Commons, he was asked as to the propriety of such duties being undertaken by persons who had filled the office of Lord Chancellor; and that he had said that he did not feel it consistent with his duty to define the persons who should be appointed to discharge those duties, but that in his opinion only men of the highest judgment in the country should discharge those duties.—The Lord Chancellor, in moving the consideration of the Commons' amendments to this Bill, referred to the amendment whereby ecclesiastical appeals were to be transferred to the new Appeal Court, and after stating that he had entered into communication with several of the bishops, said he had succeeded in arriving at an agreement with them and should, at the proper time, move the following amendment:—"The Court of Appeal, when hearing any appeals in ecclesiastical causes which may be referred to it in manner aforesaid, shall be constituted of such and so many of the judges thereof, and shall be assisted by such assessors being Archbishops or Bishops of the Church of England, as her Majesty, by any general rules made with the advice of the judges of the said court, or any five of them, of whom the Lord Chancellor shall be one, and of the Archbishops and Bishops who are members of her Majesty's Privy Council, or any two of them (and which general rules shall be made by Order in Council), may think fit to direct."—Lord Redesdale moved that the consideration of the Commons' amendments be deferred for three months. He deprecated the transfer of the appellate jurisdiction of the House, and maintained that at this period of the session there was not sufficient time to consider the Commons' amendments.—The Archbishop of Canterbury complained of the hasty way in which the amendment had been passed in the Commons, and without any consultation with the bishops. He was not unwilling to accept the modified proposal now made, because it enabled them, probably, to get out of a great difficulty. A court might be an ecclesiastical court, although consisting entirely of laymen. The new Court would be an ecclesiastical tribunal. He questioned the propriety of referring the pronunciation of sentence to the Court of Arches, in order to give some sort of authority to the Court above.—The Marquis of Salisbury pointed out that the subject of the transfer had been debated in the House of Lords. Perhaps one reason why the amendment was so readily accepted in the Commons was that in the Lords the old tribunal had had no supporters except two bishops. He could have wished that the power of summoning assessors had been extended beyond the Episcopal bench to all divines.—Lord Cairns thought nothing could be worse for this country than over-rapid legislation. The proposal of the Lord Chancellor had much to recommend it. He did not agree that there should be an indiscriminate power of summoning divines, for that would lead again to the error of a Court *ad hoc*.—The Earl of Carnarvon complained that the salaries of the judges of the Court of Appeal had been fixed at only £5,000, and at the treatment of the future Chancellors as regards pensions. He also deprecated haste. —Lord Hatherley and other noble Lords having spoken, on a division Lord Redesdale's amendment was rejected by 61 to 34.

The House then proceeded with the consideration of the Commons' amendments, and the first three or four were agreed to without discussion.

On the question that the Commons' amendment in clause 5, by which the words "Lord Chancellor" have been struck out in line 12, be agreed to, Lords Cairns objected to it, pointing out that the effect of it would be to deprive the Lord Chancellor of his proper status as the head of the Chancery division. The Commons' amendment was disagreed from by 48 to 36.

Lord Cairns moved the omission of words inserted by the Commons making membership of the Bar in Scotland and Ireland a qualification for sitting in the Supreme Court of Appeal.—The words were expunged.

The Commons amendment as to the precedence of the judges of the Court of Appeal, with verbal amendments, was agreed to.

On the question that new clause A, relating to the pension of ex-Chancellors, added by the Commons to the Bill, be agreed to, after some discussion, their Lordships disagreed to the clause.

The omission by a clerical error in clause B of any salary to the judges of the Court of Appeal was rectified. On the question of the salary of these judges, Lord Cairns said the best men would strive for those places in the Primary Court, where the salary would be higher than in the Appeal Court, and thus the former Court would be the stronger. He suggested the omission of the clause from the Bill. On a division clause B as amended was agreed to by 46 to 24.

Clauses C and D were also carried.

The Commons' amendment for the transfer of ecclesiastical appeals to the new Court of Appeal, together with

the Lord Chancellor's consequential amendment thereon, were agreed to.

The remaining amendments, with same verbal alterations, were also agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

July 18.—*Rating (Liability and Value) Bill.*—The consideration of this Bill in committee was resumed, and after some discussion and amendments with respect to the valuation of plantations or woods and rights of shooting, clauses for the rating of property occupied by the local authority, the saving of special enactments as to valuation, and the repeal of 43 Eliz. c. 2, as to saleable underwood, were agreed to and added to the Bill. The Bill was reported, with amendments.

On the question that the report be now considered, Mr. Collins moved a new clause providing for exemptions from rating of public elementary schools.—Mr. J. Talbot supported the motion. After a conversation Mr. Stansfeld said it was impossible for him to assent to the clause.—On a division the clause was rejected by 130 to 91.

The words "for any purpose," at the end of clause 6, which provided that property occupied by a local authority should be rated as if it were occupied "by a private person for any purpose," were struck out.—Mr. Cawley moved to omit from the clause words which provided that the acquisition, appropriation, and use of Government hereditaments should be taken into consideration by the assesment committee in dealing with the rating of Government property. The amendment was lost by 147 to 42.

Various verbal amendments were agreed to, and the consideration of the amendments was concluded.

The *Valuation Bill* was withdrawn.

The *Local Government Board (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill* was considered.

The *Friendly Societies Consolidated Fund Bill* was withdrawn.

The *Local Government Provisional Order (No. 6) Bill* was read a second time.

July 21.—The *Union of Benefices Bill.*—This Bill was withdrawn.

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill.—On the motion for the consideration of the amendments in this Bill, Mr. Gregory moved that the Bill be recommitted with reference to clause 14, which related to the salaries of the future judges. As the Bill stood, certain of the judges of the divisional courts would be in receipt of higher salaries than those of the judges whose duty it would be to revise their decisions on appeal. This anomaly would be removed if it were enacted that the judges of the High Court of Appeal should receive £6,000 a year each.—The amendment was negatived without a division.

The Attorney-General moved in clause 22 to add words to the effect that in all cases of appeal from ecclesiastical courts, where sentence of suspension or deprivation was to be pronounced, the cases should be remitted to the ecclesiastical court to pronounce such sentence. The amendment was in conformity with precedent, and would continue the practice followed by the Privy Council.—Sir G. Grey supported the amendment on the understanding that it would confer no new power on the ecclesiastical courts. He complained that the amendment by which ecclesiastical appeals were to be transferred to the Court of Appeal had been made in the most precipitate manner, and practically without notice; and he also complained of the rapidity with which the Government had accepted the amendment.—Mr. Bouverie said that from the time of the Reformation every tribunal constituted to decide upon the doctrines, practice, and discipline of the Church of England had been a mixed tribunal. The complaint on the part of the Church was that it was not entirely ecclesiastical. He believed that many who favoured the transfer to the Appeal Court would hereafter advocate the principle that questions of doctrine and discipline should be decided by ecclesiastics only. There was still a notion among a large body of the clergy that they were a distinct nation within a nation, entitled to determine questions, which, however, affected the laity as much as the clergy. The tendency of the amendment would be to give a leverage by which this view would be urged.

After some further discussion, the Solicitor-General said the Bill provided that the Court of Appeal should take the place of the Privy Council in advising her Majesty, so that our follow-subjects in the colonies and India should have the sentences in their appeals pronounced, as hitherto, by her Majesty herself. By a change in the Act establishing the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, provision was made for remitting its order to the Court below (say in India) to be enforced. When ecclesiastical jurisdiction was first given to the Judicial Committee, no such provision was made. A dispute arose as to whether the practice of the Privy Council was to be followed in these cases; and it was held that the Judicial Committee had power to pronounce sentence. In order to avoid a similiar dispute, the Attorney-General had brought up this amendment to set at rest the question of practice. In all these matters the ultimate courts of appeal had always remitted their sentence to the Court below. It would be incoasistent if her Majesty were to remit to the Court below in every case except in ecclesiastical cases.—The amendment was then agreed to.

Mr. W. H. Smith moved an amendment to the effect that if the divisional court should differ from the judgment of the Court below, the appeal should be reheard before a full court, consisting of not fewer than five judges, on the application of either party. There was a strong feeling that if the clause remained in its present form, and if there were to be no redress in the event of the judges of the Appeal Court differing in opinion from the Court below, injustice would be done on many occasions. In all probability the Appeal Court would only consist of three judges.—The Solicitor-General hoped that, as a rule, more than three judges would sit in the Court of Appeal.—Mr. Hinde Palmer expressed his opinion that when the judges of the Appellate Court differed among themselves it would be a desirable thing to have another rehearing. After some conversation, the amendment was rejected by 97 to 55.

Some verbal amendments were agreed to, and the Bill was ordered for a third reading.

Rating (Liability and Value) Bill.—After some discussion, this Bill was read a third time and passed.

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill.—This Bill was read a second time.

Crown Private Estates Bill.—Mr. Gladstone, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said the object of the Bill was to remove doubts as to the present state of the law. The Bill had nothing to do with the secrecy of Crown testaments, nor, as had been asserted, with certain moneys paid into the Privy Purse or other branches of the Civil List. It simply enabled the Sovereign to bequeath realty possessed in his or her personal capacity to the next heir. Everything else could be freely bequeathed, and realty could likewise, according to the opinion given by the late Lord Westbury, when Lord Chancellor, on the effect of the Acts of George III. and Victoria; but there being a contrary opinion, the question ought to be set at rest. At present the Sovereign had the power to bequeath personal estate to whomsoever he or she chose; and to bequeath realty to any person other than the next heir. There was no likelihood of such an accumulation of property in the hands of the Sovereign as to endanger the constitutional relations between the Sovereign and Parliament. But even if there was any such danger at the end of each reign Parliament had the power to revise the Civil List, and take into account the private property of the Sovereign in making such revision.—Mr. Anderson moved the following amendment:—"That it is inexpedient to extend the scope of the Act 25 & 26 Vict. c. 37, until the secrecy at present attaching exclusively to Crown testaments is abolished." He thought there was no good reason for exempting the will of the monarch of the land from the liability to be inspected at Doctors' Commons, while the exemption tended to create prejudice and suspicion in the minds of the people against the monarch.—Mr. Bouverie said the Bill proposed to alter the principle of the succession of the private estates of the sovereign in order to prevent them from falling into the general property of the Crown when the person to whom they were bequeathed succeeded to the sovereignty. The 2nd section of this Bill extended the operation of the Act of 1833 respecting the law of inheritances to the Crown. The consequence of that statute not applying to the Crown was that lands left to the heir of the Crown by the Sovereign were taken by

the successor not as devisee under the will, but as heir to the Crown, and the lands thus fell into the hereditary estate of the Crown, and could not be alienated under the statute of Anne. The policy of Parliament for a considerable time had been that the management of the hereditary estates of the Crown should be undertaken by Parliament, who in return gave a certain fixed sum to the sovereign. It might at some future time be found very convenient by those who wielded the prerogative of the Crown in that House to have at their command large independent means. He was of opinion that the House of Commons ought to restrict the Crown as far as possible to the revenue voted by Parliament at every accession. The question was one which was of as great importance to the Crown itself as to Parliament. It had hitherto been the practice that the civil list was settled on the accession of the Sovereign, irrespective of the allowance to the children. When the occasion for such a provision arose those who objected to it in that House had been always successfully met by the answer that the arrangement with the Crown had been entered into without regard to any such expense. But how would the case stand if there were to be large private estates attached to the Crown which might go on accumulating indifinitely? Would not the House of Commons be then justified in saying, "We do not know the amount of these revenues. The Crown has very large estates throughout the country, and we do not, therefore, feel called upon to provide for the children of the Sovereign?" The Solicitor-General thought the Bill had not been thoroughly understood. The doubt which the Bill was intended to solve arose from the wording of the Act of George III. That Act enabled the Sovereign to dispose of, first, estates which the Sovereign purchased out of his own money, out of the savings of his Privy Purse, or which arose from money given or left to him, and secondly, estates left to him by will, or descended, from any person not being a King or Queen of these realms. Some lawyers were of opinion that property acquired by means of the savings on the Civil List was for ever taken out of the statute of Anne, and inasmuch as the declaration of the Act of George III. said that the statute of Anne should not apply to such property, some lawyers held that that property remained alienable for ever. If that view was correct, the present Bill was not wanted. A second view that was held was that certain words of the statute were to be read distributively, and that the King for the time being who had acquired might dispose, and that King only. That was a doubtful point of law, and it was desirable to get rid of it. As to the alteration of the law of descent, the Act of George III. and the Act of the 25th and 26th of the present reign included descents as well as devises. The present Bill did not include descents at all, but only gifts, devises, or dispositions. If they had left out the word "devise," their Act would be nugatory. The old Act was supposed to have presented a difficulty, but not a difficulty in the way of her Majesty giving those estates to the Prince of Wales. The only difficulty was whether the Prince of Wales, if he became King, could alienate those estates. There was no doubt as to the power of the Queen to give those estates to the Prince of Wales. But the question was whether, when he had got them, he could alienate them. That could be got over with the greatest ease. She had only to make a will, not giving them to the Prince absolutely, but giving him a life estate, and after his death they could go to his eldest son absolutely. As to the secrecy of the Crown's will. Wills of real estate—and this Bill applied only to real estate—did not require probate. Every owner of land could, if he thought fit, make a separate will of his real estate. As to the Civil List, it had been said that, if on a future occasion when the House was about to settle the Civil List the Crown should be in posession of large landed property, it might affect the settlement. No doubt it would do so.—Sir Charles Dilke said that whether the landed estates of the Crown were or were not considerable at present, they might become so, and if they were to become considerable it would be without the cognizance of Parliament.—Mr. Henry James said the public had greater interest in property following the Crown and the State than in its being devised to strangers. If it went to the successor to the Crown there would not need to be such a large Civil List as would otherwise be required.—Mr. Anderson then withdrew his amendment.—On a division the second reading was carried by 167 to 35.—The Bill was accordingly read a second time.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners Bill.—This Bill passed through committee.

Registration of Births and Deaths Bill.—This Bill was withdrawn.

The *Local Government Board (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill* was read a third time and passed.

Endowed Schools Act (1869) *Amendment Bill.*—On the order for the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Dillwyn moved that the Bill be read a second time this day three months. He objected to several of its provisions, especially the 5th clause. He objected to officials of the Church of England being trustees by virtue of their office. They might be very unfit for such a position. He also objected to the exclusion of some of the schools from the operation of the Act.—Mr. Leatham seconded the motion. He did not object so much to what the Bill contained as to what it omitted, particularly as to the constitution of governing bodies. He complained that governing bodies had been constituted in such a manner as to wear a distinctly party complexion, and give a preponderance to one religious denomination only. In their desire to consult the wishes of the old trustees the commissioners had left them masters of the situation.—Mr. F. Powell said the intention of the Act of 1869 was not to transfer the endowments of the schools of the country, which had belonged to the Church of England, to other denominations, but rather to throw them open to all.—After some further discussion the second reading was carried by 84 to 70.—The Bill was then read a second time.

In committee on the *Extradition Act* (1870) *Amendment Bill*, Mr. Dickinson moved a new clause providing for the apprehension of fugitive criminals of Foreign States with which there is no Treaty.—The clause was negatived by 32 against 10.—The Bill passed through committee.

The *Municipal Officers' Superannuation Bill* was withdrawn.

July 22.—*Elementary Education Act Amendment Bill.*—On the motion of Mr. W. E. Forster that the House should go into committee on this Bill, Mr. Dixon rose to move the following resolution:—"That, in the opinion of this House, no amendment of the Education Act will be satisfactory which does not make the attendance of children at school and the formation of school boards compulsory throughout England and Wales, and which fails to remove the objections entertained to the principles embodied in the 25th section of the Act."—After a debate, during which Mr. Vernon Harcourt suggested the repeal of the 17th clause also, the resolution was rejected by 129 to 45.—The House then resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

On clause 3, Mr. Candlish moved an amendment, the object of which was to repeal the 25th section of the Elementary Education Act of 1870.—Mr. F. Powell hoped the House would maintain the 25th clause as a necessary means of rendering general elementary education among the people.—Dr. Playfair advocated the repeal of the 25th clause.—The amendment was rejected by 200 to 98.

Mr. Welby moved in clause 3, line 20, the insertion of the words "to be given by the guardians by way of weekly or other continuing allowance." As the Bill stood, the giving of relief was coupled with the condition that the child or children of the recipient should be sent to school. There were, however, cases of a temporary character—such as casual medical relief, &c.—in which it would work injustice if the parent was obliged for a week or fortnight to take his son from employment.—After a conversation the amendment, with an alteration and addition, was agreed to.

Mr. Reed's amendment to reduce the age of children from five to three, was withdrawn after a short discussion.

Mr. Samuelson proposed to add to the clause, "If it shall appear to a school board that the parent of any child, such parent not being in receipt of parochial relief, is unable to pay the school fees of such child, the school board shall have power to direct that such child shall be received free of charge in any public elementary school within the school district chosen by the parent, and the managers of such school shall be obliged to receive the same under penalty of forfeiture of its Parliamentary grant. Provided that no

public elementary school, not being a board school, shall be called upon to receive free of charge any number of such children exceeding one-twentieth of the number in average attendance during the preceding school year."—After a conversation, during which Mr. Dixon moved the addition of the following proviso to the amendment:—"And provided that there be room in such public elementary schools," the committee divided, and the amendment was rejected by 165 to 55.

The *Slave Trade (East African Courts) Bill* and the *Slave Trade (Consolidation) Bill* were read a second time.

Post Office Telegraph Services (Loan).—In committee on this Bill, a resolution in favour of a loan of £1,200,000 was agreed to.

Supreme Court of Judicature Bill.—On the order for the third reading of this Bill, Sir D. Wedderburn moved that in the opinion of the House it was desirable to extend the jurisdiction of the new Court of Appeal to the whole of the United Kingdom. When the present Bill became law Scotland and Ireland would be excluded from its operation, and this would create a divergence in the working of the systems of the different countries. The amendment which he proposed would help rather than hinder the Government in the fulfilment of their undertaking, that next session a Bill should be introduced dealing with Scotland and Ireland, and was in no sense hostile to the Bill, to which it was rather a supplement.—Mr. Anderson seconded the amendment.

After observations from other members, Mr. Gladstone said that as for giving a pledge that the question of Scotch appeals should be dealt with next Session, it was a rule of his never to give an unconditional pledge six months in advance. Parliament ought not to allow a Government to escape from present difficulties by drawing bills on a future session. With these reservations he thought an assurance could hardly be required from him that the Government were anxious to complete the work which had been done for England by extending it to Ireland and Scotland. The Goverment considered the work incomplete, and in some sense maimed, until it should be followed up by corresponding measures for the other two kingdoms. The amendment was then withdrawn, and the Bill read a third time and passed.

Elementary Education Act (1870) *Amendment Bill.*—In committee on this Bill clause 4 was verbally amended and agreed to.

Clause 5 was agreed to.

On clause 6, Mr. Dixon moved an amendment, in page 2, line 31, the object of which was to secure that a School Board should be established in every school district. The amendment was negatived.

Clause 7 was agreed to.

On clause 8, Mr. F. Powell moved the omission of the words disqualifying "from holding any municipal office" a person convicted of bribery under this Act.—Mr. W. E. Forster said the provision was the same as that contained in the Municipal Corporation Act and other statutes.—The amendment was withdrawn, and the clause was agreed to, as were clauses 8 and 9.

On clause 10, Mr. Collins moved an addition to the effect that the Education Department should not consent to an increase of school accommodation unless it was proved to their satisfaction that the proposed buildings were necessary. After a conversation the amendment was rejected by 116 to 71.

On clause 11, Mr. F. Powell moved after the word "Act" in line 33 to insert "after such inquiry public or other and such notices as the Education Department thinks sufficient." The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. W. H. Smith pointed out a difficulty in the way of carrying out the provision which said that all children be sent to school during a certain number of hours, in order to meet the requirements of the code. He suggested that a less number of hours at school should be deemed sufficient.—Mr. W. E. Forster said the Department was anxious to meet this difficulty, and invited suggestions in order to do so.

Mr. Dixon withdrew an amendment which he had proposed to leave out sub-section 3.

Mr. J. Lowther, in order to raise the question of compulsion, moved the omission of the sub-section which lays down the penalties to be inflicted upon parents not sending their children to school. After a conversation the amendment was rejected by 138 to 36.

Mr. Cross moved the omission of sub-section 7, in order to take the sense of the Committee whether the onus of proof should be cast upon the defendant to show that the school other than a public elementary school to which his child was sent was an efficient one.—Mr. Vernon Harcourt supported the amendment, which was ultimately rejected by 90 to 69. The clause was then agreed to, as were also the remaining clauses.

Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Heygate, Lord E. Fitzmaurice, and Mr. McArthur unsuccessfuly moved the insertion of four new clauses.

Mr. C. Reed moved the insertion of a new clause to provide that the schools shall be called upon to supply accurate returns of the attendances of the children. The clause was added to the Bill.

The schedules were then agreed to.

The *Municipal Corporation (Borough Funds) Bill.*—This Bill was withdrawn.

The *Statute Law Revision Bill* was read a second time.

The *Penalties (Ireland) Bill* passed through committee.

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman brought in a Bill for the amendment of the Defence Acts, 1842 and 1860.

The Lord Advocate brought in a Bill to amend in certain respects the Laws relating to Local Rates and Taxes in Scotland.

July 23.—*Household Franchise (Counties) Bill.*—Mr. Trevelyan moved the second reading of this Bill. The Reform Bill of 1867 gave every householder in towns, or rather in some towns, a vote or the prospect of a vote; while it gave the householders in counties nothing but a sense of grievous inequality. The question of the county franchise never was exclusively one of the rural labourers, and it was becoming less so every year. Even among the districts nominally described as rural, many were assuming the character of towns. There were more than three millions of the inhabitants of England and Wales who were not country folk but townspeople in their habits, their character, their circumstances, in their ways of thought, in everything, in short, except the possession of the ratepaying household suffrage.—Mr. O. Morgan seconded the motion.—Mr. Collins moved the "previous question"—Sir J. Kennaway seconded Mr. Collins's motion.—After other members had spoken, Mr. W. E. Forster expressed his personal approval of the Bill, and stated that he was requested by the Prime Minister, who was confined to his room through indisposition, to state on his behalf that, while the Government, as a Government, had not any opinion or recommendation to offer to the House on this question, and while he regretted that it has only been possible to bring it forward at a period of the session so late as to give the debate so much of the character of a discussion on an abstract resolution, he retained the opinion he had more than once indicated, and believed the extension of the household franchise to the counties to be one which was just and politic in itself, and which could not long be avoided. On the same grounds, not as a member of the Government, but as a private member, he should support the second reading of the Bill.—Lord John Manners protested against the sort of royal message which the Prime Minister had sent down. They were not told what was the opinion of the Cabinet on the question. It would, therefore, go to the country that her Majesty's Government had carefully abstained from expressing their collective opinion, as the responsible advisers of the Crown, on a subject of the utmost importance. The preferred to allow the question to be trailed through the recess as one which had received the support of the Prime Minister and of the Vice-President of the Council. The House was not in a position to discuss the subject of the Bill, which could not be expected to pass at this period of the session.—Mr. Fawcett said that it could not now be doubted that the Bill had been virtually taken out of the hands of his hon. friend, and had become part of the settled policy of the Government, and would occupy a prominent position in the programme, with which they would go to the country. It was impossible for the Prime Minister and one of his most influential colleagues to vote on such a question as ordinary members of Parliament. They supported the Bill and would vote for it as members of the Government, and henceforward it became—and

he was glad of it—a Government measure. Whatever might be the opinion of the Government on the subject of redistribution of political power, this he said emphatically, that if a Bill for the extension of the suffrage in counties was introduced by the Government, he would not vote for it unless the Government declared the principles to which they proposed to give effect in reference to the redistribution of political power. There were two ways by which people could be deprived of representation—one, by keeping the right of voting from them, another, by placing them in so hopeless a minority that, virtually, they must be without representation. For his part, he was willing to give manual labour all the legitimate power to which it was entitled. If manual labourers were in a majority in the country, let them be in a majority in that House. But he was not prepared to place the vast machinery of political power in their hands without taking some security that those who held different opinions from them should have some chance of representation in the House of Commons. He instanced Illinois as an instance of a most extended suffrage, where, in consequence of such extension, it had lately been found necessary to adopt the principle of the representation of minorities.—Mr. Bruce defended the Prime Minister's communication, which only expressed his well-known opinions. The expressions of the opinion of members of the Government was not improper, nor did they turn the measure into a Government one. Governments were formed with reference to certain great political questions. On those questions it was reasonable to expect an united opinion; but on other subjects the members of the Government might have diverse opinions. Two members of the Government had spoken in favour of the female suffrage Bill, but that fact did not make the Bill a Governmental measure.—Mr. Scourfield and other members then addressed the House, and the debate was adjourned.

Burials Bill.—This Bill was withdrawn.

The *Settled Estates Bill*, the *General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill*, and the *Railways Amalgamation Bill* were withdrawn.

The *Colonial Church Bill* was read a second time.

The *Extradition Act* (1870) *Amendment Bill* was read a third time and passed.

Mr. Grant Duff brought in a Bill to amalgamate the Great Southern of India and Carnatic Railway Companies.

July 24.—*Appointment of a Public Prosecutor.*—Mr. Magniac asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he could state what measures had been or were being taken, in view of the withdrawal of the Public Prosecutor's Bill, to fulfil the pledge given by the Government in 1872 to provide a remedy for the grievances admitted to exist in connection with the disallowances of expenses of criminal prosecutions.—Mr. Bruce said that the Public Prosecutor's Bill would, if it had been passed, have settled this question satisfactorily. Meanwhile it was impossible that the Treasury supervision over expenses should be discontinued. He had, however, taken care that it should be exercised with due consideration for all parties concerned, and since that time he, believed, no complaint had been made of anything like unfair or improper treatment.

Household Franchise (Counties) Bill.—This Bill was withdrawn, as was also the *Household Suffrage (Counties) Bill.*

Endowed Schools Act (1869) *Amendment Bill.*—In Committee on this Bill, after considerable discussion and many unsuccessful amendments, clauses 1 to 14 were agreed to.

On clause 15 (duration of the Commission), Mr. Collins thought it would be enough if the Commission were continued for three years, instead of five, and moved accordingly to leave out from "1876" to the end of the clause.—Mr. W. E. Forster accepted the amendment.

Clause 16 was agreed to.

Sir J. Lubbock proposed a clause which would open to the graduates of any British University the office of head master in any endowed school, which was now restricted to graduates of Oxford and Cambridge. After a conversation the clause was agreed to with verbal amendments.

After some further discussion the schedules were agreed to.

Landed Estates Court Ireland (Judges) Bill.—This bill was withdrawn.

Elementary Education Act (1870) *Amendment, &c., Bill.*—On the consideration of this Bill, as amended, some new clauses were proposed and amendments made, but all were withdrawn or successfully opposed.

Rating Liability (Ireland) Bill.—This bill was read a second time.

The amendments made by the House of Lords in the *Law Agents (Scotland)* Bill were considered. The principal amendments introduced had the effect of exempting Writers to the Signet and members of the Incorporated Society of Solicitors in the Supreme Courts from the examination prescribed by the Act as a condition of admission to practise as law agents. On the motion of Mr. Grieve and the Lord-Advocate the House disagreed with the amendment. The other amendments were then considered.

The *Ecclesiastical Commissioners Bill* and the *Penalties (Ireland) Bill* was read a third time and passed.

The *Public Schools (Eton College Property) Bill* was read a second time.

The *Slave Trade (East African Courts) Bill* passed through Committee.

The *Defence Acts Amendment Bill* was read a second time.

The order for the second reading of the *Public Meetings (Ireland) Bill* was discharged, and the Bill withdrawn.

The *Conspiracy Law Amendment Bill* passed through Committee.

OBITUARY.

LORD WESTBURY.

This great lawyer, whose death, occurring almost simultaneously with that of another distinguished member of the House of Lords, produced such a painful impression on the public at the early part of this week, was the son of Dr. Bethell, a physician living at Bradford-on-Avon, where he was born on the 20th June, 1800. After having been taught at a private school at Bristol, he matriculated at Wadham College, Oxford, when he was only fourteen years old. On taking his B.A. degree he was put into the first class in classics, and the second in mathematics, and in due time he became a fellow of his college. Having entered at the Middle Temple, he was called to the bar in 1823; and soon afterwards we find him conducting a first rate practice in the Chancery Courts. In 1840 he took silk. In 1851 he entered Parliament on the Liberal side as member for Aylesbury, and was made Vice-Chancellor of the Duchy Palatine of Lancaster. In 1852 he was Solicitor-General, and from 1856 to 1858, and again from 1859 to 1861 he was Attorney-General. In 1859 he ceased to represent Aylesbury, and became member for Wolverton. In 1861, on the death of Lord Campbell, he became Lord Chancellor, which office he resigned in 1865 under painful circumstances which, though betraying a certain laxity of administration, did not reflect on his own personal honour. He died on the 21st of July, 1873. He was twice married, first in 1825, to Miss Abraham, by whom he had a family, and secondly, in January of the present year, to Miss Tennant.

Of Lord Westbury's abilities as an advocate, practising, it must be recollected, before judges and not before juries, it is difficult to speak without seeming to make use of exaggerated language. His command of every part of the case before him was complete, while his knowledge of English law and the general principles of jurisprudence was not surpassed, if it was equalled, by any of his contemporaries. Nor did he fail to make the utmost use of all his powers. No regard for the feelings of others, nor, it was thought by some, for his own reputation for fair dealing, ever prevented him from making every effort to win his cause. As a judge, although sometimes inclined to shoot a poisoned shaft or two of that peculiarly insolent satire which distinguished him, yet, on the whole, he was courteous and patient. His judgments do not need any eulogy from us. They stand in the law reports as monuments of clear, graceful enunciations of great principles, admirably laid down and skilfully applied to the facts of the particular case. As a law reformer, his reputation was perhaps greater than his actual works quite justified. His Land Registry Act was a failure, and the Bankruptcy Act of 1861 did not give much satisfaction. The Succession Duty Act, the Divorce Act, and the Fraudulent Trustees Act are among the more important measures, the passing of

which was caused to a great extent by his exertions; but his name will not go down to posterity associated with any great measure of reform. Perhaps the greatest service which he rendered in this respect was the spectacle of a great practical lawyer interesting himself in the spread of the principles of jurisprudence as Chairman of the Council of Legal Education, and as President of the Juridical Society.

We ought not to close this notice of Lord Westbury without acknowledging the great public services recently rendered by him as arbitrator in the European Assurance Society. Most of his important judgments in the cases submitted to him in the course of the arbitration have already appeared in our columns; and they, and the few remaining judgments which will shortly make their appearance testify that to the very last, while his body was worn with pain and dis ease, his intellect was as clear and powerful as ever.

We have, of course, nothing to do in this journal with Lord Westbury's private disposition. During his life he was thought by most people to be hard and disdainful; but since his death so many eminen t persons have testified to his great kindliness of nature, that we must conclude that beneath all the sarcastic bitterness that lay on the surface of his character there beat a humane and genial heart.

SIR DAVID SALOMONS, BART.

It does not seem to have been generally noticed that this gentleman, who was so well known in mercantile circles, was, nominally at any rate, a member of the legal profession. He was called to the Bar by the Middle Temple in 1849, being then about fifty-two years of age. We need not say that he never practised. He died on the 18th inst. at the age of seventy-six.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

HUDDERSFIELD LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held on the 2nd instant, Mr. G. W. Morrison in the chair. A discussion took place on the following questions:—"Can a creditor who issues a writ, and afterwards takes out a debtors' summons for the same debt, recover costs on both, although before the hearing of the debtors' summons the debt and costs on the writ have been paid?" "A. lets to B., who sublets to C.; A. obtains an order for possession in the county court, under 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, s. 50, against B., and turns out C., who was in possession. Can C. maintain an action of trespass against A.?" (*Hudson* v. *Walker*, 20 W. R. 489.) Both questions were decided in the negative.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices.
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	115
Stock	Caledonian	100	93½
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	123
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	40
Stock	Great Northern	100	129
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	134½
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	114
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	119½
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	148
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	75
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	21¼
Stock	London and North-Western	100	145½
Stock	London and South Western	100	107½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	74½
Stock	Metropolitan	100	73
Stock	Do., District	100	31
Stock	Midland	100	136½
Stock	North British	100	64¾
Stock	North Eastern	100	163½
Stock	North London	100	117
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	70
Stock	South Devon	100	72
Stock	South-Eastern	100	107½

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, July 25, 1873.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92¾	Annuities, April, '85 9⅞
Ditto for Account, Sep. 92¾	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
3 per Cent. Reduced 92¾	Ex Bills, £1000, — per Ct. 3 dis.
New 3 per Cent., 92¾	Ditto, £500, Do —3 dis.
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, —3 dis.
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 4½ per Ct. (last half-year) 248
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ditto for Account,
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 10½ p Ct. Apr. '74, 205	Ind. Enf. Pr., 5 p C., Jan. '72
Ditto for Account. —	Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79 103½
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 168	Ditto Debentures, per Cent., April, '64 —
Ditto for Account. —	Do. Do, 5 per Cent., Aug. '78 101
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88 104	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —	Ditto, ditto, under £1000
Ditto Enfaced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 96½	

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The week commenced with a decided improvement of tone in every department of the Stock Exchange. During the week railway stocks went up; but on Wednesday Great Western relapsed. In the foreign market prices rose. On Thursday the Bank rate was again reduced, and is now at 4. The proportion of reserve to liabilities is now as high as 49¼ per cent. It is thought that next week the Bank rate will be further reduced to 3½. On Friday there was increasing firmness in public securities.

The subscription list for the issue by the Illinois Central Railroad Company of 3,000,000 dollars 7 per cent. Consolidated Gold Bonds of each of the New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern and Mississippi Central Railroad Companies will close on Monday, the 28th inst., for London, and on Tuesday for the country.

APPEAL FROM THE LORD CHANCELLOR TO THE LORDS JUSTICES.—On Wednesday last the first appeal from the Lord Chancellor sitting as Master of the Rolls was hear by the Lords Justices. They affirmed his Lordship's deci sion.

THE EUROPEAN ARBITRATION.—The death of the Arbitrator (Lord Westbury) has, of course, caused an interruption to the proceedings. By the European Society Arbitration Act it is enacted that in the event of a vacancy the Lord Chancellor shall appoint an arbitrator, such arbitrator being a person filling or having filled the office of a judge in one of the superior courts of law or equity in the United Kingdom, or being a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

VICE-CHANCELLOR MALINS' COURT.—The Vice-Chancellor has announced his intention of making an arrangement with the view of facilitating the clearing off of the arrears of motions in this branch of the Court, which, if carried out, will be a great convenience to the suitors and the Bar—viz., that a list of all motions ripe for hearing, taken in order of date shall be drawn, up, and a sufficient number placed in the paper each day, the hearing of the motions so set down to commence on Monday next, and to continue *de die in diem* until the whole are disposed of.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

By Messrs. NORTON, TRIST, WATNEY & Co.

Sussex, near Crawley.—The Handcross Park Estate, of 143a. 3r. 14p., freehold—sold for £10,920.

Surrey, near Letherhead.—Freehold enclosures, containing 40a. 2r. 5p.—sold for £6,870.

Sussex, West Hoathley.—A residence and 44a. 1r. 5p., freehold—sold for £2,810.

Two freehold farms, containing 103a. 0r. 27p.—sold for £3,000.

By Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE.

Poplar.—Nos. 97, 99, and 101, Grundy-street, freehold—sold for £785.

Nos. 16 and 17, James-street, freehold—sold for £500.

Nos. 8 to 11, Garden-place, copyhold—sold for £200.

By Messrs. BAKER & SONS.

Peckham—Freehold ground rents of £46 16s. per annum—sold for £960.

By Messrs. GADSDEN, ELLIS & Co.

Surrey, Bromley.—A tithe rent-charge of £27 2s. 8d. per annum—sold for £550.

BIRTHS MARRIAGES AND DEATHS

BIRTHS.

FORSTER—On July 22, at Beamish Park, county Durham, the wife of J. Douglas Forster, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a son.

MACARTHUR—On July 21, at 29, Downshire-hill, Hampstead, the wife of Robert J. Macarthur, Solicitor, of a son.

SWAINSON—On July 19, the wife of Joseph Swainson. Esq., Solicitor, Kendal, of a daughter.

MARRIAGE.

PEARSON—HEWAT—On July 23, at St. Augustine's Church, Highbury New-park, Charles John Pearson, M.A. Barrister-at-Law, to Elizabeth, eldest daughter of M. Grayhurst Hewat, Esq., of 38, Highbury New-park.

DEATHS.

DAVIES—On July 21, at Weston-super-Mare, Rees Edward Davies, B.C.L., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, in the 32nd year of his age.

SPARKES—On July 20, at Dawlish, Perry Sparkes, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, July 15, 1873.

Milne, Charles, Alfred Riddle, and Edward D. Mellor, Attorneys and Solicitors, Inner Temple, Dec 25.

TUESDAY, July 15, 1873.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Worcester City and County Library and Reading Institution.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated July 4, it was ordered that the above institution be wound up. Taylor, Mayson and Taylor, Furnival's inn, agents for Pidcock and Sons, Worcester, solicitors for the petitioner.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

North of Europe Wood Pulp Company, Limited.—V. C. Malins has, by an order dated July 7, appointed Baker Philip Daniels, Poultry, to be official liquidator.

Tramway Wheel Plant and General Foundry Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Bacon, dated July 5, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Wild, Barber, and Browne, Ironmonger lane, petitioners' solicitors.

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

West Drakewalls Mining Company.—Petition for winding up, presented July 12, directed to be heard before the Vice-Warden, at the Princes Hall, Truro, on Wednesday, July 23 at 10. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing, in opposition to the petition, must be filed at the Registrar's Office, Truro, on or before July 19, and notice thereof must, at the same time, be given to the petitioners, the solicitor or agents. Hodge, Hochin, and Marrack, Truro, petitioners' solicitors; Gregory and Co., Bedford row, agents.

FRIDAY July 18, 1873.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

New Mutual Permanent Benefit Building Society.—Petition for winding up, presented July 17, directed to be heard before V. C. Bacon, July 26. Child, South square, Gray's inn, Solicitor for the Petitioner.

Weald of Kent Railway Company.—The creditors are required, on or before Sept 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to Abraham Rooke James, Gresham House, Old Broad st. Tuesday, Nov 4, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Guerrero Gold Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 16, directed to be heard by V. C. Bacon, July 26. Robinson, Gresham House, Old Broad st, Solicitor for the Petitioner.

TUESDAY, July 22, 1873.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Imperial Bank of China, India, and Japan, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Wickens, dated July 11, it was ordered that the above Bank should be wound up by the Court. West and King, Cannon st, Solicitors for the Petitioners.

Licensed Victuallers' Co-operative Supply Association, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 18, directed to be heard before the M.R., on Friday, Aug 1. Linklater & Co, Walbrook, Solicitors for the Petitioner.

North of Europe Wood Pulp Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before Saturday, Aug 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. Baker Philip Daniels, Poultry. Wednesday, Nov 5, at 13, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Patent Floor Cloth Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before Monday, Aug 11, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Browne, 15, Mosley st, Manchester. Monday, Nov 3, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Radcliffe Investment Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before Aug 7, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. Peregrine Watson, Bury. Tuesday, Nov 4, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Tramway Wheel Plant and General Foundry Company, Limited.—V.C. Bacon has fixed Aug 1, at 1, at his chambers, for the appointment of an Official Liquidator.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, July 22, 1873.

Campton, Shefford, and Meppershall Benefit Society, Meppershall, Bedford. July 19

St. George Advance Fund Association, Nos. 9, 13, & 18. V.C. Bacon has fixed Monday, July 28 at 12 at his chambers, for the appointment of an Official Liquidator.

True Ivorites Friendly Society, British School, Penrhyn-deudraeth, Merioneth. July 17

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, July 15, 1873.

Austin, Mary Elizabeth, Uckfield, Sussex. Aug 20. Puddicombe v Sparks, V.C. Wickens. Sparks, Crewkerne

Elworthy, William, sen, Westford, Somersetshire, Woollen Manufacturer Aug 11. Elworthy v Ingpen, M.R. Rowcliffe, Stogumber

Ewen, Rev William Henry Leman, Southwold, Suffolk. Aug 11. Ewen v Gooch, M.R. Robinson, Lincoln's inn fields

Ferguson, Amelia, Holland Villas rd, Kensington. July 25. Wright v Lambert, V.C. Bacon. Wright, Carlisle

Hargrave, Sarah, Harrogate, Yorkshire. Oct 10. Kinsley v Clapham, V.C. Wickens. Rawson and Best, Leeds

Hooper, William Wills, Exeter, Esq. Sept 1. Hooper v Hooper, V.C. Bacon. Drake, Exeter

Savery, Mary, Hayford, Devonshire. Sept 1. Gill v Powning, V.C. Wickens. Pemberton and Reeves, Lincoln's inn fields

Slyfield, Frances John, Weymouth, Dorsetshire, Lodging house Keeper. Aug 1. Hawks v Fowler, V.C. Malins. Andrews and Co, Weymouth

Wicking, James, West Malling, Kent, Grocer. Sept 1. Wicking v Viner, V.C. Malins. Norton, Town Malling

Williams, John, Tyn-y-Coed. Llanbeblig, Carnarvon, Farmer. Aug 31. Re John Williams Estate, V.C. Wickens. Jones, Carnarvon

Wood, Humphrey Williams, Woodville, Upper Norwood, Gent. Sept 1. Baillie v Wood, V.C. Malins. Murray, Whitehall place

FRIDAY, July 18, 1873.

Bigg, John, Moors End, Bucknighamshire, Brickmaker. Aug 4. Crake v Goldswain, V.C. Malins. Spicer, Great Marlow

Clay, John, Shirland, Derbyshire, Yeoman. Sept 1. Clay v Clay, V.C. Wickens. Wilson, Alfreton

Williams, Elizabeth, Ewyas Harold, Herefordshire. Sept 1. Lewis v Lewis, V.C. Bacon. James and Bodenham, Hereford

Wilson, Thomas, Impney Farm, Ddoderhill, Worcestershire, Farmer. Sept 1. Wilson v Wilson, V.C. Malins. Chamberlain, Ledbury

TUESDAY, July 22, 1873.

Caley, Nathaniel Henry, Norwich, Norfolk, Silkman. Sept 1. Caley v Caley, V.C. Wickens. Coaks, Norwich

Mills, Williams, Deal, Kent, Licensed Victualler. Aug 31. Watt v Mills, V.C. Wickens. Henderson, Fenchurch st

Schwartz, John Ferdinand, Little Queen st, Civil Engineer. Sept 1. Carruthers v Ridley, V.C. Malins. Hopgood, Whitehall place

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, July 15, 1873.

Adams, George, South Shields, Durham, Boot Dealer. Aug 12. Tinley and Co, North Shields

Aspin, George, Bradford, Yorkshire, Tanner. July 19. Lees and Co, Bradford

Bate, William, Helsby-by-Frodsham, Cheshire, Gent. Aug 23. Ashton and Garratt, Frodsham

Bateman, Agnes, Ulverston, Lancashire. Sept 1. Remington, Ulverston

Brown, Ann, Brighton, Sussex. Sept 1. Pitman and Lane, Nicholas Lane, Lombard st

Bulmer, Joseph, Headingley, Leeds, Gent. Aug 12. Bulmer and Son, Leeds

Catalan, Gabrielle, Greek st, Soho, Grocer. Sept 1. Aird, Eastcheap

Cecly, William George, High st, Poplar, Clerk. Aug 31. Marsh, High st, Poplar

Dales, Benjamin, Louth, Lincolnshire, Joiner. Aug 4. Bell, Louth

Dann, John, Brecknock rd, Camden rd, Holloway. Aug 31. Roberts, Godliman st, Doctors' Commons

Ellison, Richard, Bald's-pond rd, Gent. Sept 1. Aird, Eastcheap

Furner, Robert, Brighton, Sussex. Esq. Aug 10. Haycock, College hill

Gould, Franklin, Charlotte st, Bedford sq, Doctor. Aug 15. Robertson, Gloucester House, Harders rd, Peckham.

Handley, Joseph, Box Hill, Surrey, Gent. Aug 21. Bailey & Co, Berners st

Harrison, Peter, Weaverham, Cheshire, Postmaster. Sept 1. Fletcher, Northwich

Heyward, Mary, Redcar. Aug 15. Ingoldby, Darlington

Lee, Jane, Southport, Lancashire. Aug 12. Hinnell & Co, Bolton

Lee, Richard, Southport, Lancashire, Gent. Aug 12. Hinnell, Bolton

Millett, Charles, Queen's gate terrace, Kensington, Esq. Aug 16. Roscoe & Co, King st, Finsbury sq

Mills, Henry, Dowlands Farm, Surrey, Farmer. Sept 1. Morrison, Reigate

Needham, Mary, Manchester, Drysalter. Aug 16. Whitworth, Manchester

Oswin, John, Leicester, Draper. Sept 1. Billings, Leicester

Poore, Mary, Warminster, Wilts. Aug 15. Jones & Bilson, Liverpool

Rutherford, John Buckley, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Esq. Sept 10. Thomson, Lincoln's inn fields

Stent, Charlotte Ann, Stamwell, Middlesex. Sept 29. Haycock, College hill

Swinbank, John Dowson, Darlington, Durham, Licensed Victualler. Sept 1. Hutchinson and Lucas, Darlington

West, George, Clark's terrace, Cannon st rd, Stone Mason. Aug 30 Humphreys, East India chambers, Leadenhall st

Wright, Hannah, Gravesend, Kent. Aug 31. Marsh, High st, Poplar

FRIDAY, July 18, 1873.

Bartlett, William, Ladbroke Lodge, Notting Hill, Surgeon. Sept 17. Lambert, Bedford row

Bassendine, George, Derby. Aug 30. Robotham, Derby

Blewett, Ephraim, Kempley, Gloucestershire, Gent. Sept 1. Mansfield and Sons, Ledbury

Bowyer, Frances, Southampton. Aug 7. Sharp and Co, Southampton

Bromley, Dame Anne, Park st, Grosvenor square. Aug 23. Whateley & Co, Birmingham

Christie, John Christopher, Mansell st, Aldgate, Gas Fitter. Aug 20. Glynes and Son, Leadenhall st,
Cripps, Charlotte, Hastings, Sussex. Sept 18. Fearon and Clabon, Great George st
Curran, John, Liverpool, Stevedore. Aug 12. Teesay and Lynch, Liverpool
Evans, John Christopher, Devonshire villas, Lower rd, Rotherhithe. Aug 15. Hillearys and Tunstall, Fenchurch buildings, Fenchurch st
Greaves, Joseph, Bradford, Yorkshire, Gent. Sept 1. Green, Bradford
Hewitt, George, Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, Yeoman. Oct 1. Birdand Hays, Gainsborough
Howard, Hon Richard Edward, Stranraer place, Maida Vale. Oct 1. Few and Co, Henrietta st, Covent garden
Humphreys, Mary, Seymour place, Bryanstone square. Sept 1. Bennett, Furnival's inn
Keane, Rev William, Whitby, Yorkshire. Sept 20. Gray and Pannett, Whitby
Lucy, John George, Lower Thames st, Fish Salesman. Sept 30. Wilde and Co, College hill
Nisbett, Henry, High Beech, Essex, Esq. Aug 25. Browne and Co, Margaret st, Cavendish square
Parratt, Thomas Fanshaw, Effingham, Surrey, Esq. Sept 10. Kempson and Co, Abington st Westminster
Phillips, Henry, Erdington, Warwickshire, Gent. Sept 20. Cottrell, Birmingham
Potter, Thomas, Talbot court Gracechurch st, Gent. Aug 30. Gammon, Barge yard, Bucklersbury
Ramsey, Joshua, Somerton row, Hackney, Gent. Aug 31. Harling, Fleet st
Richardson, John, Derby, Currier. Sept 1. Whiston and Cooper
Robinson, Joseph, Tynemouth, Northumberland, Builder. Aug 30. Tinley and Co, North Shields
Rushton, James Raine, Toxteth Park, Liverpool, Gent. Oct 1. Houghton, Liverpool
Thompson, Thomas, Bradford, Yorkshire, Joiner. Sept 1. Green, Bradford
Twigg, John, Bristol, Currier. Aug 14. Stanley and Wasbrough, Bristol
White, Sarah, Salisbury, Wilts, Innkeeper. Aug 20. Kelsey and Son, Salisbury
Wills, William, Heigham, Norwich, Fellmonger. Aug 15. Tillett and Co, Norwich
Wright, James, Stanhope st, Hampstead rd, Dentist. Aug 30. MacGregor, Bloomsbury sq

TUESDAY, July 22, 1873.

Bickham, George, Bicknoller, Somersetshire, Gent. Aug 19. White and Son, Williton
Boddington, Frances, Kingsthorpe, Northampton. Aug 31. Boddington, Markham square, Chelsea
Chesterton, Thomas, Jones Port, State of Maine, America. Sept 1. Eagleton, Newgate st
Duke, Henry, Earnley, Sussex, Yeoman. Aug 28. Sowton, Chichester
Evans, Sarah, Chester. Aug 15. Boydell and Co, Chester
Ferris, Harriet, Lordship lane, Dulwich. Aug 30. Saffery and Huntly, Tooley st
Gill, Rev Arthur Daniel, Macclesfield, Cheshire. Aug 19. Killmister and Co, Macclesfield
Hewlett, William, Twyford, Southampton, Saddler. Aug 20. Collins, Winchester
Hildyard, Charlotte Jane, Stokesley, Yorkshire. Sept 1. Wilcox, Stokesley
Hill, John, Stephen Royd, Yorkshire, Gent. Sept 10. Busfield and Atkinson, Bradford
Hirst, Job, Ingleton, Yorkshire, Contractor. Aug 12. Pearson & Pearson, Kirkby Lonsdale
Hornby, James, Liverpool, Watch Manufacturer. Sept 1. Hill, Liverpool
Leicester, Frederic, Teignmouth, Devon. Sept 1. Nicholl & Newman, Howard st, Strand
Lowe, Joseph Corbett, Liverpool, Corn Merchant. Sept 12. Wareing, Liverpool
Mainwaring, Gordon, Whitmore Hall, Staffordshire, Esq. Oct 21. Lawrence & Graham, New square, Lincoln's inn
McCreight, Rev William Walkinshaw, Worthing, Sussex. Sept 1. Willis & Willis, Winslow, Bucks
Mills, Joseph, Great Bridge, Staffordshire, Engineer. Oct 20. Caddick, West Bromwich
Quiddington, Margaret, Richmond, Surrey. Aug 15. James and Co, Ely place, Holborn
Smith, Ann, Horsebrook, Staffordshire. Sept 29. Deakin and Dent, Wolverhampton
Stanger, Sarah, Hunstanton, Norfolk. Sept 1. Taylor, Norwich
Steele, Caroline Maria, Southport, Lancashire. Aug 22. Laces & Co, Liverpool
Vaughan, James, Huntingdon, Gent. Oct 1. Maule & Burton, Huntingdon
Weaver, Ann, Halton rd, Islington. Sept 1. Dubois, King st, Cheapside
White, James, Witham Friary, Somersetshire, Yeoman. Sept 18. Dunn & Payne, Frome
Wilkin, Ann, Downham Market, Norfolk. Sept 1. Reed, Downham Market
Wood, Letty, Holles place, Chelsea. Aug 22. Roy & Cartwright, Lothbury

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, July 18, 1873.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Anstey, Christopher John, Guildford st, Russell square, Barrister-at-Law. Pet April 8. Spring-Rice. July 31 at 1
Byrt, Frederick Valentine, Rye lane, Peckham, Tobacconist. Pet July 14. Brougham. July 30 at 1
Elt, Charles, Victoria rd, Holloway. Pet July 15. Hazlitt. July 31 at 2

To Surrender in the Country.

Cottam, William, Bradford, York, Reed and Heald Maker. Pet July 15. Robinson. Bradford, Aug 5 at 9
Hudson, Heron, Birmingham, Provision Merchant. Pet July 15. Chauntler. Birmingham, Aug 5 at 2
Muslewhite, Charles, Longfleete, Poole, Saddler. Pet July 14. Dickinson. Poole, July 29 at 11
Paterson, James Mundell, Gateshead, Durham, Agent. Pet July 15. Mortimer. Newcastle, July 31 at 12
Porter, Johnson, Norwich, Grocer. Pet July 14. Palmer. Norwich, July 30 at 12
Smith, John, Bridgewater, Somerset, Grocer. Pet July 15. Lovibond. Bridgewater, July 30 at 10
Thompson, Walter, Handsworth, Stafford, Cowkeeper. Pet July 16. Chauntler. Birmingham, Aug 5 at 12
Wood, Francis, Bradford, York, Whitesmith. Pet July 16. Robinson. Bradford, Aug 5 at 12

TUESDAY, July 22, 1873.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Cousins, Charles, Pritchard's rd, Hackney rd, House Agent. Pet July 19. Pepys. Aug 6 at 1
Gay, John, Stamford st, Blackfriars rd, Tailor. Pet July 19. Pepys. Aug 7 at 11
Hoe, Thomas Samuel, Lawrence Pountney hill, Wine Merchant. Pet July 18. Spring-Rice. Aug 7 at 12
Mann, Leonard, Maddox st, Tailor. Pet July 17. Pepys. Aug 6 at 12.30
Newnham, William, South side, Paddington Basin, Coal Dealer. Pet July 17. Pepys. Aug 6 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Clyde, Cecile, Spencer park, Wandsworth. Pet July 15. Willoughby. Wandsworth, Aug 5 at 11
Fayer, William, Liverpool, Baker. Pet July 19. Watson. Liverpool, Aug 6 at 2
Iverson, William Joseph, Norwich, Leather Seller. Pet July 16. Palmer. Norwich, Aug 6 at 11

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, July 18, 1873.

Hill, George, Pershore, Worcestershire, Auctioneer. July 9

TUESDAY, July 22, 1873.

Mills, Walter, Braintree, Essex, Corn Dealer. June 13
Wade, Edward J., Mitre court chambers, Fleet st. June 17
Warner, George Robert, Dagenham, Essex, Market Gardener. July 19

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, July 18, 1873.

Arnold, John Gregory, Derby, Pianoforte Tuner. July 31 at 3 at office of Leech, Full st, Derby
Banks, John Robert, St Neots, Huntingdon, Butcher. July 24 at 4 at offices of Day and Wade-Gery, St Neots
Barker, John Wells, Bedford, Plumber. Aug 5 at 11 at office of Tebbs, St Peter's green, Bedford
Barker, Louis Vere Irving, Crown court, Old Broad st, Stockbroker. July 30 at 2 at offices of Bailey, Tokenhouse yard
Barr, Charles, Chandos st, Strand, Engraver. July 26 at 11 at office of Willis, St Martin's court, Leicester square
Bell, Richard, Cobham, Surrey, Manager of a Public Company. Aug 13 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Elmslie & Co, Leadenhall st
Bentley, Thomas, Longton, Staffordshire, Painter. July 29 at 11 at the Union Hotel, Longton. Hawley, Longton
Borrows, William Bunting, High Holborn, Refreshment house Keeper. Aug 11 at 3 at offices of Gammon, Barge yard, Bucklersbury
Coombes, Charles James, Pancras rd, Boot Manufacturer. Aug 5 at 3 at offices of Birchall, London Wall. Harrison, Furnival's inn, Holborn
Corby, Thomas, Nottingham, Cabinet Maker. July 30 at 12 at offices of Acton, Victoria st, Nottingham
Court, Matthew, Morton-on-Swale, Yorkshire, General Dealer. Aug 5 at 1 at offices of Teale and Son, Bedale
Creswell, John Pearson, Ramsgate, Surgeon. Aug 6 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Treherne and Wolferstan, Ramsgate
Dare, John, Birmingham, Builder. Aug 1 at 12 at the Great Western Hotel, Monmouth st, Birmingham. Kennedy, Birmingham
Davis, Morris, Manchester, Agent. Aug 5 at 4 at offices of Best, Brown st, Manchester
Deakin, Matthew, Stockport, Cheshire, Boot Manufacturer. Aug 11 at 2 at offices of Brown, Market pl, Stockport
Dent, George, Bristol, Butcher. July 31 at 12 at offices of Hancock and Co, Guildhall, Bristol. Benson, Bristol
Eaton, William John, Grove st road, South Hackney, Cricket Bat Manufacturer. July 30 at 2 at offices of Naunton, Blomfield st
Emery, Samuel Palmer, Wednesfield, Staffordshire, out of business. July 30 at 10.30 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton
Evans, David James, Swansea, Glamorganshire, Hatter. July 29 at 11 at offices of Davies and Hartland, Rutland st, Swansea
Fisher, Robert Stanford, Thearne, Yorkshire, Farmer. Aug 6 at 12 at offices of Stead and Sibree, Bishop lane, Kingston-upon-Hull
Ford, William, Warrington, Lancashire, Cabinet Maker. July 29 at 3 at offices of Bretherton, Bank st, Warrington
Fowler, George, Hartley Green, Staffordshire, Farmer. Aug 11 at 12 at offices of Greatrex, Greengate st, Stafford
Frechet, Francis Fordham, Baker st, Portman square, Milliner. July 28 at 3 at offices of Marshall, Lincoln's inn fields
Garrett, Jane Ann, Carlisle, Schoolmistress. July 30 at 2 at the County Court Office, Law's lane, Carlisle. Carrick, Wigton
Gilman, Frederick, Nottingham, Boot Maker. July 29 at 12 at offices of Belk, High pavement, Nottingham
Glover John, Thomas Wilson, William Glover, and David Buckley Whitecak, Silsden, Yorkshire, Wood Turners. July 24 at 11 at office of Terry and Robinson, Market st, Bradford

Grimsey, Thomas, Clarendon st, Clarendon square, Builder. July 23 at 2 at offices of Summons, Chancery chambers, Quality ct, Chancery lane. King, Walbrook

Hall, Richard, Blackburn, Lancashire, Mill Manager. Aug 5 at 3 at office of Boote and Edgar, George st, Manchester

Hallett, Henry George, Compton st, Clerkenwell, Zinc Worker. July 31 at 2 at office of Hubbard, Long lane, West Smithfield

Hamilton, James, Manchester, Saddler. July 30 at 3 at offices of Sutton and Elliott, Brown st, Manchester

Hart, James, Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts, Cabinet Maker. July 28 at 11 at offices of Shrapnell, Bradford-on-Avon

Henn, John George, Rosemary rd, Peckham, Baker. July 23 at 3 at offices of Ody, Trinity st, Southwark

Holliday, John, Silloth, Cumberland, Boot Maker. July 31 at 12 at offices of McAlpin, Devonshire st, Carlisle

Hollings, John, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Wholesale Grocer. July 26 at 11 30 at office of Draper, Finkle-st, Stockton-on-Tees

Hood, James, jun. Melcombe Regis, Dorset hire, Watch Maker. Aug 6 at 12 at the Auction Mart, Market st, Melcombe Regis. Howard

Howarth, James, Rochdale, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturer. July 30 at 3 at offices of Standring, Bury, Rosdale

Hoyle, James, Acre, Lancashire, Labourer. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Hall, Queen st, Accrington

Hugh, John, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Master Mariner. Aug 2 at 11 at offices of Morris, Rutland st, Swansea

Hughes, John, Corwen, Merioneth, Attorney. Aug 1 at 12 at the Wynnstay Arms Hotel, Wrexham. Adams, Ruthin

Johnston, William, sen, and William Johnston, jun, Thursby, Cumberland, Farmers. July 31 at 1 at offices of Hough, Fisher st, Carlisle. McKeever, Wigton

Jones, Emma, Hulme, Manchester, Beersellor. July 31 at 3 at office of Smith and Boyer, Brazennose st, Manchester

King, George, and James King, Stoke Goldington, Bucks, Builder. July 25 at 3 at the Swan Hotel, Newport Pagnall. Stimson, Bedford

King, George Frederick, Waterloo, Dorsetshire, Boot Maker. July 28 at 11 at the Swan Inn, Stalbridge. Davies, Sherborne

Knight, Charles, Mildmay place, Back rd, Kingsland, Baker. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Bell's Pond rd, Islington. Willis, Charles square, Hoxton

Leetham, William, Kingston-upon-Hull, Timber Merchant. July 31 at 11 at offices Hearfield, Scale lane, Kingston-upon-Hull

Lewis, Thomas, Adwyr Clawdd, Denbigh, Builder. July 31 at 1 at the Lion Hotel, Wrexham

Loy, Parkin, Bradfield, Yorkshire, Forgeman. July 31 at 12 at offices of Patteson, Bank st, Sheffield

Mellor, Edwin, Saddleworth, Yorkshire, Manufacturer. July 31 at 3 at offices of Hanchett, Union st, Oldham

Nicholson, William, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Boot Dealer. July 30 at 2 at offices of Downham, Market st, Birkenhead

Nowell, Edward, Aberystwith, Cardigan, Hairdresser. July 23 at 11 at 1, Baker st, Aberystwith. Atwood

Platt, Thomas, High st, Kingsland, Fancy Draper. Aug 5 at 3 at offices of Burton, Serjeant's-inn, Fleet st

Rankin, John Robert, Liverpool Licensed Victualler. Aug 5 at 2 at offices of Hughes, Lord st, Liverpool

Redfearn, Joseph, Heckmondwike, Yorkshire, Rag Merchant. July 31 at 3.30 at offices of Scholefield, Brunswick st, Batley

Roberts, Benjamin Cawood, Scisset, Yorkshire, Grocer. Aug 4 at 1 at the Cherry Tree Inn, Hnddersfield. Green, Bradford

Rowlands, Richard, Carnarvon, Wine Merchant. July 26 at 11 at office of Jones, Market st, Carnarvon

Runge, Hendrich Christian Conrad, Shepperton rd, Islington, Grocer. Aug 1 at 2 at offices of Birchall, London Wall. Harrison, Furnival's inn, Holborn

Scheuten, Joseph, Liverpool, Cotton Merchant. Aug 8 at 2 at offices of Harmood and Co, North John's st, Liverpool. Hull and Co, Liverpool

Shalders, Frederick, Primrose st, Bishopsgate, Stable Keeper. Aug 2 at 3 at offices of Popham, Vincent terrace, Islington

Single, James, Stepney green, Builder. July 30 at 1 at offices of Bettsley, London Wall

Softley, William, Martock, Somersetshire, Builder. July 28 at 3 at the Red Lion Inn, Yeovil. Hobbs

Solomon, Henry, Oxford st, Silversmith. July 24 at 3 at offices of Lumley and Lumley, Conduit st, Bond st

Stacey, Henry, Landseer terrace, Kensington, and James Henry Stacey, Bridge place, Harrow rd, Coal Dealers. Aug 1 at 2 at office of Murr, Bush lane

Statham, Charles, Nunhead Brickfields, Peckham, Brickmaker. Aug 4 at 2 at office of Stopher, Coleman st

Stockdale, Henry, Knaresborough, Yorkshire, Currier. July 31 at 2 at the Griffin Hotel, Boar lane, Leeds. Kirby and Son, Knaresborough

Swallow, Michael, and George Swallow, Heckmondwike, Yorkshire, Carpet Manufacturers. July 30 at 11.30 at the Great Northern Railway Station Hotel, Leeds. Brook and Co, Huddersfield

Thompson, George Henry, North Ormesby, Yorkshire, Brick Manufacturer. Aug 1 at 12 at offices of Pybus and Hudson, High row, Darlington. Addenbrooke

Thorp, Charles, Rochester, Kent, Grocer. July 31 at 11 at offices of Nickinson and Co, Chancery lane. Pratt, Rochester

Tomlin, Daniel, Leigh, Essex, Coal Merchant. Aug 5 at 3 at offices of Ditton, Ironmonger lane

Trowell, Richard William, Maidstone, Kent, Grocer. July 28 at 1 at the bridge House Hotel, London bridge, Southwark. Goodwin, Maidstone

Waddington, John Hick, Denton, Lancashire, Draper. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Storer, Fountain st, Manchester

Walthe, Peter, Wolverhampton, Staffordshire, Lock Manufacturer, July 30 at 3 at offices of Stratton, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Wight, Joseph, Bath, Nurseryman. July 31 at 11 at offices of Witchell, Lansdowne, Stroud

Wood, William, Leeds, Provision Dealer. July 29 at 12 at offices of Fullan, Bank chambers, Park row Leeds

TUESDAY, July 22, 1873.

A'Beckett, Gilbert Arthur, Wellington st, Strand, Journalist. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of Evans and Co, John st, Bedford row

Adie, Francis, Bilston, Staffordshire, Grocer. Aug 5 at 12 at the Talbot Hotel, King st, Wolverhampton. Ratcliffe, Wolverhampton

Ambler, Abraham, and Adam Dracup, Bradford, Yorkshire, Jacquard Machine Makers. Aug 1 at 11 at offices of Rhodes, Duke st, Bradford

Arthy, Thomas Blyth, Chelmsford, Essex, Bookseller. Aug 13 at 12 at Dick's Coffee House, Fleet st

Baker, John Frederick, Richmond, Surrey, Dyer. July 31 at 2 at offices of Cave, Finsbury circus

Barfor, James, Winchester, Hants, Innkeeper. Aug 5 at 1 at offices of Stocken and Jupp, Lendenhall st. Lee and Best, Winchester

Barker, Joseph Edwin, Leeds, Boot Manufacturer. Aug 4 at 3 at office of Fawcet and Malcolm, Park row, Leeds

Beaumont, Emily Jane, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Milliner. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Moore, Duncan st, Birkenhead

Bedwell, Joseph, Epping, Essex, Grocer. Aug 1 at 3.30 at 29, Mark lane. Young and Sons

Bickers, Jonathan, Ampthill square, Hampstead rd, Schoolmaster. July 30 at 11 at Sanderson's Hotel, Bevois court, Basinghall st. Fisher, Asylum rd, Peckham

Birkett, Solomon, Everton, Lancashire, out of business. Aug 15 at 3 at offices of Lowe, Castle st, Liverpool

Bond, Edward, Buckingham, Veterinary Surgeon. Aug 2 at 10 at the Swan and Castle Hotel, Buckingham. Stockton, Banbury

Brewer, Charles Geach, Hampstead rd, Corn Dealer. July 31 at 3 at offices of Baxter, King st, Cheapside. Fisher, Mitre court, Temple

Brown, George, Dartmouth, Devonshire, Boarding Clerk. Aug 4 at 1 at the Marine Tavern, Dartmouth. Curtois, East Stonehouse

Brown, William, and John Nunns, Commercial st, Shoreditch, Cabinet Manufacturers. Aug 1 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Reed and Lovell, Basinghall st

Butler, John, Sittingbourne, Kent, Brickmaker. Aug 13 at 3 at offices of Gibson, High st, Sittingbourne

Caudwell, William, South Wingfield, Derbyshire, Farmer. Aug 12 at 11 at office of Cutts, New square, Chesterfield

Cooke, Edwin Walter, Bognor, Sussex, Cordwainer. Aug 12 at 3 at office of Janman, East Pallant, Chichester

Cooper, Richard, Sittingbourne, Kent, Carter. Aug 13 at 11 at offices of Gibson, High st, Sittingbourne

Cornwall, Robert, jun, Framlingham, Suffolk, Coachbuilder. Aug 1 at 11 at offices of Watts, Butter market, Ipswich

Court, William, jun, Headless Cross, Ipsley, Warwickshire, Soda Water Manufacturer. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Simmons, Evesham st, Redditch

Cuninghame, Rosa, Ebury villas, Teddington, Widow. Aug 5 at 2 at offices of Murray, Whitehall place

Davies, David, Swansea, Glamorganshire, Ironmonger. Aug 1 at 2.30 at offices of Barnard and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol. Davies and Hartland, Swansea

Davies, Richard Williams, Nantwich, Cheshire, Chemist. Aug 5 at 2 at offices of Lisle, Nantwich

Digwood, Henry, Llanwarne, Hereford. Aug 7 at 11 at offices of Llanwarne, East st, Hereford

Dixon, Daniel, Newport, Monmouth, Bookseller. July 31 at 11 at office of Lloyd, Bank chambers, Newport

Dove, Benjamin Peter, Powis st, Woolwich, Tailor. July 31 at 2 at office of Phelps and Sidgwick, Gresham st

Duggan, Joseph, Maryport, Cumberland, Draper. Aug 4 at 11 at 68, Crosby st, Maryport Collin, Maryport

Edwards, Edward, Mold, Flint, Grocer. Aug 6 at 2 at office of Harris, Union court, Castle st, Liverpool

Edwards, John Hawley, Shrewsbury, Salop, Attorney-at-Law. Aug 6 at 11 at the Raven Hotel, Shrewsbury. Newill

Fisher, Samuel, Union court, Old Broad st, Silk Merchant. Aug 7 at 12 at office of Broom and Co, Coleman st. Boyce, Abchurch lane

Gawne, Edward, Chester, Builder. Aug 4 at 12 at offices of Duncan and Pritchard, Bridge st, Chester

Gay, Jacob, jun, Fulham rd, Brompton, Builder. July 30 at 3, at 9 Lincoln's inn fields. Marshall

Gill, Robert, Malpas, Cheshire, Brazier. Aug 14 at 2 at the Fox and Goose Inn, Whitchurch. Brooke, Nantwich

Goodman, Benjamin John, Lewisham, Kent, Wine Merchant. Aug 5 at 3 at offices of Edwards, Lincoln's inn fields

Green, Solomon Abraham, Goulston st, Whitechapel, Pickle Manufacturer. Aug 5 at 2 at office of Poole, Bartholomew close

Greig, Charles, Manchester, Boot Maker. July 30 at 3 at offices of Dawson, Ridgefield, John Dalton st, Manchester

Gross, Henry Glenn, and George Edward Fox, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturers. July 29 at 11 at offices Becke, Market square, Northampton

Hazell, Charles, Ashby, Norfolk, Miller. Aug 2 at 12 at offices of Stanley, Bank plain, Norwich

Henninger, John, St Leonards st, Bromley-by-Bow, Baker. Aug 7 at 2 at offices of Bailey, Tokenhouse yard

Hethorn, Richard Lawrence, Altrincham, Cheshire, out of business. Aug 6 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Rideal and Shaw, Manchester

Hinkinson, Thomas, Gold's green, Staffordshire, Beersellor. Aug 4 at 11 at office of Topham, High st, West Bromwich

Hughes, Thomas, Leicester, Boot Manufacturer. Aug 1 at 12 at office of Owston, Friar lane, Leicester

Hunt, John, Burgh St Margaret, Norfolk, Miller. Aug 8 at 12 at offices of Wiltshire, Regent st, Great Yarmouth

Jackson, William, Cambridge, Toy Dealer. Aug 5 at 11 at offices of Ellison and Burrows, Alexandra st, Petty Cury, Cambridgshire

Kent, John, Sheffield, Bed Maker. Aug 8 at 4 at office of Gee, Fig tree chambers, Sheffield

Lamb, George, Hackney rd, Cabinet Manufacturer. Aug 5 at 3 at office of Pullen, Cloisters, Temple

Legge, Richard, Great Cambridge st, Hackney rd, Wardrobe Manufacturer. Aug 5 at 3 at offices of Lawes and Co, City rd, Holmes, Eastcheap

Lester, John, Sittingbourne, Kent, Engineer. Aug 13 at 1 at the Fountain Hotel, Sheerness. Gibson, Sittingbourne

Lewis, William Percy, Swansea, Glamorganshire, General Draper. July 31 at 12 at offices of Brooks, King st, Manchester. Davies & Hartland, Swansea

Lusted, Caroline, and Eliza Lusted, Ore, Sussex, Schoolmistresses. Aug. Aug 6 at 11 at 11 at 1, Clive Vale villas, Ore, near Hastings. Heathfield, Lincoln's inn fields

Marsh, John, Cottenham rd, Hornsey rd, Islington. Commercial Clerk Aug 6 at 12 at offices of Toynbee Liverpool rd, Islington. James, Serjeant's inn, Chancery lane

Mason, William Henry Goodburn, Brighton, Sussex, Printseller. Aug 6 at 12 at 33, Gutter lane. Lamb, Brighton

Maury, Rutson, jun, Liverpool, out of business. Aug 8 at 11 at offices of Gibson and Bolland, South John st, Liverpool. Anderson and Co, Liverpool

McFadden, Robert George, Wigan, Lancashire, Grocer. Aug 2 at 11 at offices of Leigh and Ellis, Arcade, King st, Wigan

Meakin, Henry, Cossal Marsh, Notts, Farmer. Aug 11 at 12 at the Assembly rooms, Low pavement, Nottingham. Cowley

Nash, William, Three Colt st, Limehouse, Butcher. Aug 14 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Islington. Heathfield, Lincoln's inn fields

Neumann, David, Moritz Gingold, and Gustav Hirschfeld, St Mary Axe, Colonial Merchants. July 31 at 3 at offices of Quilter and Co, Moorgate st

Owers, James, Braintree, Essex, Publican. July 31 at 2 at offices of Christmas, Walbrook

Palmer, Alfred, Norwich, Boot Manufacturer. Aug 6 at 4 at offices of Sadd, Church st, Theatre st, Norwich

Patterson, Joseph, Hulme, Manchester, Grocer. Aug 6 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester

Porter, George, Bristol, Carpenter. Aug 6 at 1 at offices of Swete and Burroughs, Bridge st, Bristol

Pritchard, Robert Harrison, St George's square, Upton, Superannuated Surveyor of Customs. Aug 5 at 2 at offices of Brighten, Bishopsgate st Without

Ratsey, Richard Stephens, Winchester, Milliner. Aug 7 at 11 at office of Wooldridge and Son, Upper Brook st, Winchester

Roberts, Edward, Rhydydion fawr, Denbighshire, Farmer. Aug 1 at 3 at the Crown Hotel, Denbigh. Roberts, Denbigh

Roberts, Frederick, Leeds, Grocer. Aug 1 at 12 at offices of Whiteley, Albion st, Leeds

Roberts, Thomas, Great Grimsby, Lincolnshire, Smack Owner. Aug 4 at 11 at offices of Grange and Wintringham, Great Grimsby

Roe, Stephen, Manchester, Commission Agent. Aug 6 at 3 at offices of Kearsley, Brazennose st, Manchester

Roscow, John Scowcroft, Bolton, Lancashire, Grocer. Aug 5 at 3 at offices of Dutton, Acresfield. Bolton

Saks, Isaac, Houndsditch, Importer of Foreign Goods. Aug 5 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Murray, Sackville st, Piccadilly

Simmonds, Henry, Warwick, Soda Water Manufacturer. July 30 at 3 at the Woolpack Inn, Warwick, Sanderson, Warwick

Simpson, Matthew Henry, Cleckheaton, Yorkshire, Oil Merchant. Aug 4 at 3 at offices of Curry, Cleckheaton

Speh, Adam, London st, London rd, Southwark, Baker. Aug 7 at 3 at office of Birchall, London Wall. Harrison, Furnival's inn

Stoddart, George Henry, Brighton, Sussex, Clerk in holy orders. Aug 11 at 2 at 34, Old Jewry. Black and Co, Brighton

Stokes, Frederick, Walsall, Staffordshire, Buckle Manufacturer. Aug 1 at 11 at offices of Adams, Goodall st, Walsall

Summers, James, Norbiton, Surrey, Builder. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Wragg, Great St Helen's

Sydney, Edgar, and Edward Joynes Wiggins, Fowke's buildings, Great Tower st, Ship Brokers. Aug 6 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Crump, Philpot lane

Symington, William Weldon, Halstead, Essex, Engineer. Aug 6 at 12 at 19, Bishopsgate st Within. Harris and Morton, Halstead

Tarplee, George, Birmingham, Clerk. Aug 1 at 3 at offices of Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham

Thornton, Robert Clint, Stock Orchard crescent, Caledonian rd, out of business. Aug 5 at 4 at offices of Beard and Son, Basinghall st

Treadgold, William, Monks Kirby, Warwickshire, Butcher. Aug 6 at 2 at offices of Homer, West Orchard, Coventry

Tydeman, Edmund Manasseh Tomlinson, Brighton, Sussex, Optician. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of Chalk, Ship st, Brighton

Ward, Frederick Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer. July 29 at 3 at offices of Beck, Market square, Northampton